

*Kolby (J)*

4  
4139.b  
4

A THIRD  
DEFENCE  
OF  
Ministerial Conformity  
TO THE  
Church of ENGLAND.

In Answer to  
Mr. CALAMY's *Objections*  
against the Former;

IN A  
LETTER

Annext to his  
THIRD PART  
OF  
Moderate Nonconformity.

---

L O N D O N,

Printed by J. Downing for R. Burrough at  
the Sun and Moon in Cornhill, 1706.



1873

ad scripta

TRAET A JHN

1873

ad scripta

1873

ad scripta

TO THE

# READER.

THE great Design we had in view, both in the Beginning and Progress of this Undertaking, which we have been engaged in, and which we have carefully pursu'd, hath been to vindicate our selves from those Imputations, which by the Representations Mr. Calamy hath given of the Terms of Conformity, were laid upon our Practice, in submitting our selves to the legal Establishment; to the End that we might procure a favourable Opinion of what we have done, by removing the Prejudices, which by such a Representation might be apt to be taken up by unwary Readers against our Office and Ministry. And we shall now closely pursue the same Design, in what we have in hand, in answer to

Mr. Calamy's Letter, and his Index at the End thereof. Whether by this fresh Undertaking (which Mr. Calamy's renewed Assaults have obliged us to) we shall put an End to this Controversy, we are not able to determine: But we shall endeavour to bring it into a very narrow Compass; by cutting off all unnecessary Disputes, which do not properly or directly belong to our Defence; and by shewing to every careful Reader these several Things, viz. How small a Part of our last Defence hath been so much as touch'd upon, or pretended to be answer'd by Mr. Calamy; as also how much he doth concede and grant us under the several Heads; and lastly, How little Force there is in his Objections against what he continueth to oppose. And we shall refer all his Personal and Angry Reflections, and whatsoever is excentric to our Defence; and all other Mat

terial small or great, which were  
or would be found in said Letter  
after it should

ters of leſſer Moment, to our Anſwer to his Index, that we may more nearly put together, and take notice of those Things wherein our Defence is directly concerned. And in all this we ſhall endeavour to have the Apostles Exhortation ſtill in our Eye, to purſue the Things that make for Peace, and the Things wherewith we may edify one another.

**John Ollyffe.**

---

**THE**

**ERRATA**

PAGE 58. line 2, for glorified in, read glorified. p. 64. l. 27, for affent r. assert. p. 66. l. 28. for in r. & and after later r. than it is in the Heavens. p. 141. l. 3. after should r. not,

# THE CONTENTS.

<b>O</b> F our Subscription to the <del>XX</del> th of the XXXIX. Articles pag. 2 Of the Declaration of Assent and Consent	p. 10.
That it is not to the Imposing	p. 11
Our Submission to some Impositions vindicated	p. 13.
Objections against our Submission answered	( p. 18
What the Approbation is which is imply'd therein	p. 25
That it is to the Use only, or Things prescribed	p. 32
Of the Salvation and Regeneration of Infants baptized	p. 42.
Of Godfathers and Godmothers	p. 45.
Of exclusive Terms of Communion, with respect to Baptism	p. 53.

## The Contents.

Of the Use of the Sign of the Cross	p. 57
Of excluding from the Lord's-Supper those that dare not Kneel	p. 61
Of the three Orders of Ministry	p. 64
Of the Office of Burial	p. 65
Of the Rule to find out Easter	p. 66
Of the Apocryphal Lessons	p. 67
Of the Old Version of the Psalms	p. 70
Of the Damnatory Sentences	p. 72
Of the Rubrick about Confirmation	p. 76
Of the Oath of Canonical Obedience	p. 77
Of the Canons of 1603	p. 92
Of the Ecclesiastical Courts	p. 94
Of the Advantages which Mr. Calamy pretends to have above us in the Ex- ercise of his Ministry	p. 96
In Answer to Mr. Calamy's Index	p. 133
In Index to this Third Defence; with some Reference to the former.	p. 159

## A Third

## The Queen

1. <u>Persons</u> <u>baptized</u>	p. 41
2. <u>Mother</u> and <u>Grandmother</u>	p. 45
3. <u>Terms</u> <u>of</u> <u>Communion</u> , <u>in</u> <u>relation</u> <u>to</u> <u>Baptism</u>	p. 51

of *Ministerial Conformity*.  
A **THIRD** Defence  
**DEFENCE**  
**OF**  
**Ministerial Conformity**  
**TO THE**  
**CHURCH of ENGLAND.**

**M**RI. Calamy hath some things in the Beginning of his Letter, with respect to the Ejected Ministers, the conforming Puritans, his Vindication of himself from exposing us to our Brethren, his History of High and Low Church; which, because they do not directly belong to our Defence of Ministerial Conformity, we shall either wholly pass by, or only take some little notice of in our Answer to his Index.

**B**

And

## A Third Defence

And as for the Head of *Re-ordination*, which comes next, *He thinks he hath said enough* and saith, *He is not for needless Repetitions* and we are as little for them as he; and think that we have fully answered all that he hath said, which he *saith*, *He hath seriously consider'd*: But what the Result of that *serious Consideration* hath been, he leaveth us in the *dark about*, and so we shall pass it. Especially considering that this is no Part of our *Defence*; and if he cannot be satisfy'd with what we have advanc'd about that matter, which doth not concern us, we shall leave it as we found it.

*Of our Subscription to the 20th Article.*

So that all we have now to proceed upon in this our *Defence*, is contain'd under Three Heads, *viz.* our *Subscription* to the 20th of the 39 Articles, *The Declaration of Assent and Consent*, and the Particulars under it; and the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*.

I. *Of our Subscription to the 20th Article.* This Article is what he assaulted in his *Introduction* to his former Book, *Mod. Nonconformity*, part 2, and is what is frequently reflected upon, and opposed by him there. This Article saith, *That the Church hath Power to decree Rites and Ceremonies*; but then presently adds, *That yet it is not lawful for the Church*

ordain any thing that is contrary to God's Word written. The Design of which Article seems originally to be, in Opposition to the Papists, (as very many of the rest were) to assert the Power of National Churches, against the Usurpations of the Church of Rome, which would have the whole Power of determining all things, both in Faith and Worship; and would oblige all to submit to, and acquiesce in her Determinations alone. For these very Words, which Mr. Calamy now reflects upon, were one main Position maintain'd by the Protestants in that famous Disputation with the Papists *primo Eliz.* set down by Bishop Burnet in the latter End of his *History of the Reformation*. This Claim of National Churches against the Usurpations of Rome, is at large vindicated, by the same Learned Bishop in the *Articles*, pag. 374.

And we are apt to think, Mr. Calamy himself hath not been long of one Mind in this matter. He tells us, *Abridg.* pag. 653. That two Thirds of the Nonconformists would have come in to the Church upon the Concessions in the Jerusalem Chamber with the further Allowance in Point of Orders made *13 Eliz. Cap. 12.* which Allowance is this, That their Ordination should be own'd upon their subscribing to all the 39 Articles. These Terms he seems to have had a good Opinion of,

of, and consequently of the 20th Article amongst the rest: Yet now he reproacheth and falls foul upon this part of it ( being no requir'd to subicrbe it by the Toleration Act ) and writes a good part of his *Introduction* in Opposition to it.

In Defence of the controverted Position of this Article to which we have subscrived, we explain'd from Dr. Burgess, what is meant by *Rites* and *Ceremonies*, viz. *External Circumstances* in the Worship of God, there described and bounded. And Mr. Calamy himself, now is not for making any difference between *Circumstances* and *Ceremonies* in Divine Worship, though in his former part he was much for having us beed the same. See our *Second Defence* pag. 47. And we shew'd him from the Article, what *Rites*, *Ceremonies*, or *Circumstances* of Worship, are here meant, viz. such as are warranted by the Word of God, or such as are not contrary to God's Word written. For the Article presently denies, That the Church hath Power to ordain any such: So that there is an express Limitation in the Article to those only that are not contrary to the Word; that is, for Matter, or Manner, or End, or Use: If any *Circumstances* or *Ceremonies* upon these, or any other Accounts, are contrary to the Word, the Article denies that the Church hath Pow-

to ordain them. And therefore we subscribe to the Church's Power, affirm'd in the Article, with respect only to those that are so contrary. And this is all that the Article saith of this matter, or that we are obliged by it to own: and one would think, there should be no great Hazard in all this. And for the better Elucidation of this, we give him a large Induction and Enumeration of Scripture Instances, of such Sort of Rites and Ceremonies in the Old Testament, which had their Original only from the Jewish Church; without any Divine Command enjoying the same; notwithstanding they had so many Rivalries of Divine Appointment, and such severe Prohibitions in the Law, of adding any thing to the Word of God. We shew'd that some were approved by ~~the Lord~~ himself, and some by his Apostles; two of which had Reference to one of the Sacraments, *wit*, the Lord's Supper; one of which [the *Kiss of Love*] us'd after Prayer, and before the Administration of it, is Dr. *Whitby* observes out of *Justin Martyr*, See *Whitby* on *Rom. 16. 16.* Of this sort are those which Mr. *Baxter* mentions and approves of, *Christ. Direct. part 3. Qu. 133.* as which *Translation of the Bible to be us'd in Churches*; *the Manner or Tune in singing of Psalms*; *what Version or Metre to use*; *whether*

A Third Defence is to  
to pray in the same Words often, or in various  
to use a written, or printed Form, or neither,  
to read it on the Book, or to speak it by Me-  
mory ; to have Sponsors or Witnesses of the  
Parents Trustiness, or the Child's Covenant, or  
no ; whether there shall be any Musick by In-  
struments in the Church, for the Praises of God,  
and what ; by what Sign or Ceremony we shall  
take an Oath ; what Words the Churches Pro-  
fession of Faith shall be express'd by ; and by  
what Sign the Church shall signify their Con-  
sent : So for decent Habits of Cloths, and for  
decent Gestures not particularly commanded ;  
what Gesture to receive the Lord's Supper in ;  
in which, he saith, the Scripture no more regu-  
lates us, than about the Room, the Hour of  
communicating, the Number of Communicants,  
the Place, &c.

Some things Mr. Calamy himself doth not  
deny, but that there may be general Regu-  
lations of, viz. such as are necessary or expedi-  
ent, without which the Worship of God cannot  
be perform'd. Now this is enough or suffi-  
cient to the Defence of this Article now before  
us, which speaks not of these particular Ce-  
remonies or Circumstances, which are the  
matter of Dispute, but of such Rites or Ce-  
remonies in the general, as are warranted or  
allowed by the Word, to be determin'd or  
decreed by the Church, without deciding there-  
in,

## of Ministerial Conformity.

7

in, which or which not, She is thereby warranted to decree; nor doth it speak any thing of the enforcing *Penalties*, for the Observation of what is decreed; in which therefore we are no way concern'd neither, in our Subscription hereunto.

In our *Second Defence* indeed we did proceed further, for the sake of those that scrupled the Churches Power in the determining these Rites or Circumstances, which are now contested among us; hoping thereby we might give some Satisfaction to them therein; to which we refer the Reader, as also to the latter part of the *Letter* directed to me, before our *Second Defence* was published. But this was no necessary Part of our *Defence* of this *Article*: And therefore, because we are willing to make this *Controversie* (as far as we are concern'd in it) as short as may be, we shall add no more about that matter. The *Article* is only an indefinite Proposition, design'd, as we have said, against *Papal Usurpations upon National Churches*: And it is sufficient to warrant our Subscription to it, to believe in the general, That the *Church hath Power to decree* some such Ceremonies or Circumstances; though we should think She is not warranted by the Word, to decree any more than Mr. *Calamy* allows: nor do we see any thing that is or can be ob-  
jected against it.

B 4

There

There is only one thing that we shall farther take notice of, with respect to the *Churches Power* in these matters; that according to Mr. Calamy, it doth properly belong to every particular worshipping *Assembly* only, to determine all *indifferent Circumstantials* of Worship; whereas we think it very reasonable, that when there are *some indifferent Circumstantials*, which may concern *all worshipping Assemblies* in a Nation alike, that they should have a more general *Regulation or Determination*. There may be indeed *some indifferent Circumstantials*, which it may be most proper for every *particular Congregation* to determine for themselves; but for those which concern the Worship of *all Assemblies* alike, one would think, in the very Reason of the thing, it should be more proper to have them *nationally or provincially determined*, for the greater *Order or Uniformity*-sake, suitably to the Nature of such *larger, or more extensive Societies*, to which a suitable *Power and Government* must also necessarily belong. For where there are *Societies* there must be *Government* to preserve the *Peace, Regularity and Order* thereof: So in *Provincial and National Societies*, consisting in the Combinations of *lesser particular ones*, there must be *Provincial and National Government*, suitable to their *Nature and Extent*. For if the *lesser Societies*

## of Ministerial Conformity.

9

Societies cannot subsist without Government, when the distinct Interests and Apprehensions of Men are fewer; much less can the greater Societies subsist in Peace and Order, without a Government proper to their large-  
ness. So that for a National Society there must be National Government; as for a particular Congregational Society, there needs a particular or Congregational Government. As it is impossible there should be Order in any Corporation, without Orders relating to it; so neither can a Nation be governed without such peculiar to the whole.

— Give to thy Mother what thou wilt allow  
To every Corporation. Herbert.

It is allowed that there cannot be Order in any particular Congregation, without some Rules obligatory to the same; so neither can Order be observed by the Churches of a Kingdom, unless united by some Common Laws obligatory to the whole; which Union doth constitute a National Hierarchy.

And now where there is Government greater or lesser, there must be Power too, for fixing and determining proper Regulations in that Society, to which the Government belongs. Government without Power is no Government at all, or of no Use: So that Power

Power is essential to Government, of what Nature or Form soever it be. And as there must be Civil Power for Civil Government for regulating Men in their Civil Acts; so in Ecclesiastical Government, there must be Ecclesiastical Power for those things that are proper thereunto. And both Government, and Power arise from the general Nature and Necessities of Society, and the Confusions and Miscarriages, that it is subject to without it. And where the Government is, there is the Power; and where the Government extends further than single Congregations, so doth the Power. And where there is a National Society of Christian Professors confederated together in a Christian Government, it is sufficient if there be a Grant of Power given by their Consent to their Representatives, to settle common Regulations that may be necessary or expedient for the publick Peace or Order, whether in purely Civil or Ecclesiastical Cases, without needing any further Debate about Church-Power.

II. We come now to the Declaration of Assent and Consent, which Mr. Calamy saith, is a capital part of this Controversie. And there are these two things to be considered with relation thereunto, viz. The Imposition imply'd; and our Approbation of

Of the Declaration of Assent and Consent.

## of Ministerial Conformity.

11

of, and Consent to those things in which it doth consist, and how far it extends; which we shall therefore severally, but briefly consider.

1st. Of the *Imposition*. Here is indeed an *Imposition* imply'd that is to say, to be imposing. of several things to be used by

those, who have the Liberty of publick Ministrat<sup>ion</sup> in the establish'd Church. Here is an *Imposition* of a Liturgy, consisting of several Offices; here is an *Imposition* of certain Habits, Signs, Modes and Gestures to be used in the several Offices: Concerning all which we consider in this place, that our *Approval*, *Affent* and *Consent* does respect the *Use* of these things that are impos'd, not the *Imposition* of them: We are not requir'd to give *Affent* and *Consent* to the *Imposing*, or to give our *Approval* thereof, but only of the *Use*, when they are impos'd. We are not at all concerned in the *imposing*, nor are we bound to declare that *that* was well done, either in it self, or in its Circumstances. The *Imposition* is the *Act* of our *Governours*, and is past and over; our *Declaration* respects what we are to do hereafter our selves. Our *Governours* do not expect or demand that we should pass a *Judgment* of *Approval* upon their *Act*, but upon those things that belong to our own. In the *Twentieth Article* indeed we subscribe to the *Power* of *decrewing* or

or *imposing*; but then it is only in *general*, (as we have shewn) and the *Particulars* are not express'd. Here we declare our *Assent* and *Consent* to the *Use* of the *Particulars*, but not to the *Imposition* of them at all.

Now 'tis the *Imposing*, that Mr. Colamy saith, *he is principally against*: And it is against that, that a great Part of his *Introduction* is directed. Well, he may enjoy his own *Opinion* in that Matter, and so may others for all this Declaration; in which we only declare our *Assent* to the *Use* on our Part, and not to the *Imposing* on the *Governours* Part. This Distinction Mr. Colamy allows, and himself insists upon with Reference to the *Ministers* that afterward were ejected. *Mod. Non. part 3. p. 84.* There is, saith he, a double *Judgment* to be allowed for; a *Judgment* what *Terms* to fix in the *Establishment*, and a *Judgment* how far the *Terms* that are fix'd by the *Establishment* may warrantably and safely be comply'd with. And then he shews us most rightly; that as the one is accountable to God for the *Terms* fixed, so are the others for their *Compliance* or *Non-Compliance* with those *Terms*. Hence he tells us, *p. 86.* That they [the Ejected *Ministers*] could, generally speaking, have come into the *Establishment*, had King Charles his *Declaration* past into a *Law*.

But

But what if a Thing be sinfully impos'd, or without due Authority, which may in it self be lawfully us'd? (for Circumstances do often mightily vary or alter an Act) Must not we consider, you'll say, the Lawfulness of the *Imposition*, as well as the Lawfulness of the Thing impos'd? Or may we promise a stated Compliance with a lawful Thing, when the *Imposition* is sinful, and there is no Authority for it? Would not this be to betray our Liberties, and to share in the Sin of the *Imposition*, by our joining with it, and encouraging of it? This is what sticks with Mr. Calamy, and he is against the Submission for the imposing sake. Governours no doubt may be sometimes guilty of an Encroachment of Power; and may decree or ordain what is not in the Verge of it; and the *Imposition* may be unprofitable, or unseasonable, or with too great Rigour, or too severe Penalties: There may be Humour, or there may be Passion, or there may be Inconveniencies like to ensue, that may be to the Detriment of a great Part of the Society: And to speak freely, we are, as well as our Brethren, for preserving our Liberties both Civil and Sacred. The Liberties of Men should not be restrain'd but for the Publick Good, or the Benefit of the Society to which they

they belong: And where the *Inconveniences* are greater than the *Conveniences*, it is highly *unreasonable*. But then we consider with all, that this is often a very *dubious* Case; and we are not always able to judge how far the Power and Authority may *extend*, nor of the other Things that do accompany the *Imposition*: And in such a *doubtful* Case, which we are very often not competent Judges of, it must be then the *safest* way to submit, because we cannot be sure, but that the Power may extend so far. They can oblige us to some Things, and we have general Commands for Subjection to them; and when it is not very *clear*, that their Commands are exorbitant or without their Verge; in that Case it is only *lawful* or *unlawful* that we must determine our selves by. But suppose, for Argument sake, the Matter be *clear* and evident to us, that the Power is extended too far in that Case, We say not that Submission is a *Duty* on our part, out of Conscience to the Command; for it may be argued, that where there is no *rightful* Authority to command, there can be no *Obligation* to *Obedience*: But yet if the Things be *lawful* that they Command, tho' they may not have *rightful Power* to abridge us of our *Liberty*; yet we may *voluntarily quit* it, if we will, for *Peace* sake, and the avoiding

voiding other Inconveniences that would be more detrimental to the Society than such Submission would be: And we must profess, that we are mighty for *Peace*, as well as for *Liberty*. *Peace* is a most valuable Purchase, though it should be at the Expence of some *Liberties*, that may well be spared without any *Damage*. It is worth the while, and it is the true Nature and Notion of *Publick-spiritedness*, to yield up our own Rights, even those sometimes which we cannot conveniently spare, for the preserving of the *Publick Peace*; and much more those that we may spare, without any *Damage* to our selves. And in Case of *indifferent* and *useful* Things (supposing that we are satisfy'd that they are so), wherein we may limit or restrain our selves, we cannot apprehend, that it is any considerable *Damage* to us, to submit to the *Imposition*, or *Restraint* of others for *Peace* and *Union* sake. As the *minor Part* (according to Mr. Calamy) doth and should do when the *major Part* determines a Matter in a dissenting Congregation. Yet thus we may be *obliged* to submit upon other Accounts, though not on the Account of the Power to impose, *viz.* on the Account of *Peace* and *Unity*, and the *Commands* of God in *Scripture* respecting them.

And

And again, We are many times as little able to judge of the *vivifying Circumstance* of a Command or Imposition on the Gouvernours Part, though there should be such as we are of the *Extent* of their Power; nor can we be accountable for them by our Submission. It would be a very hard Case, in an *Inferior*, in *Performance* of any Act of Obedience to the Command of one that is over Him, must be *responsible* for all the Circumstances of his Command, if He doth obey; or must *demur* in his Obedience, till He is satisfy'd therein; though He be never so well satisfy'd of the Matter of his Command. Unless *Lawful* or *Unlawful* only be the Boundaries, one way or other, in such Cases, that we must attend to, it is hard to know when we are obliged or when not.

If we apprehended that the Things determined or imposed, were *unlawful in themselves*, or contrary to the Divine Law, which is superior to all Humane Ordinances, We hope we should be as much against submitting to them, as Mr. Galamy can be, or any other Person: For we would not fight or contend against God, but *must obey* God rather than Men. But whilst we think them *lawful in themselves*, and incur no Harm, and commit no Sin in the Use of them, we cannot allow our selves in a Refusal of Obedience.

ence, when our Governours demand it of us. We think we are bound by the general Commands, That every Soul should be subject to the Higher Powers; and that we should obey them that have the Rule over us; when upon Examination we find the Things commanded are not sinful, nor any way hurtful to us, and they insist upon our Submission thereunto. And we could not excuse our selves from an unreasonable Stifness and Refractoriness, if we should refuse, or do otherwise. They that have another View of Things, and apprehend *Unlawfulness* in them, must necessarily be excused, whilst these Apprehensions continue; for no Man ought to act contrary to the Evidence of Things appearing to him, when he can have no other View but of the *Unlawfulness* of them; But where the *Lawfulness* of the Things appears with Light and Evidence, and there is no Hurt or Damage scories to us thereby, it seems to us to be much the safer way to be on the side of Submission, than of that which contradicteth and opposeth; and to leave the Judgment of *Expediency* and *Conveniency* to others, which is most properly the Enquiry of our Governours. It is Mr. Baxter's Doctrine quoted 2 Def. p. 73. Think not that is *unlawful* to be obey'd, which is *unlawfully commanded*: for we shall not be judg'd by these

Laws of God, which made the Rulers Duty, but by that which made our own. And Mr. Calamy himself stands to his Assertion, Lett. p. 302. That a Magistrate may oblige his Subjects to attend on the Worship of God in the way ----- against which they do not pretend so much as Matter of Conscience. Only he adds now, That there may be just Matters of Conscience pretended against a Way of Worship, which yet is so far lawful, as that serious Persons may obtain the Divine Blessing. By which he means, that he and others may have just Grounds not to submit: This is to himself and them; As for us, we do not pretend Matter of Conscience against the Way of Worship impos'd; and therefore, according to him, the Magistrate may oblige us to Conformity; and we, and others who are alike persuaded of the Lawfulness thereof, are bound to submit.

But there are two Things Objections a. that Mr. Calamy urgeth against our Submission to the present Impositions.

The one is, That our stated Compliance with them would encourage the Imperators, and be likely to prove a Temptation to a further Progress in the way of Impositions. Let. p. 303. If it do this, it is certainly by Accident only:

We

We encourage others indeed, our Fellow-Sab-  
jects, by our Compliance with the Imposi-  
tions, to comply as we do; because that is an  
Act of the same kind with our own; and  
by doing as we do, we give an Example  
to others to do so likewise. *Imposition*  
is the *Governours Act*, and is an *Act* of  
one kind, proceeding upon certain Reasons  
in them; but *Submission* is *our Act*, and is an  
Act of another kind, and proceeds upon other  
Reasons in *ourselves*. Now, how does *our*  
*Act* that is of *one* kind, and for Reasons pro-  
per to *us*, justify and excuse *that* of others,  
which is of *another* kind, and that proceeds  
upon Reasons proper to *them*? And if *our*  
*Act* does not justify or excuse *another's*,  
How does it encourage it, unless it be *per ac-  
cident*? But are *occidental Consequences*, that  
proceed upon *other Reasons* in *others*, to be  
imputed to *us* as *our Act*, that is not con-  
cern'd in, and doth not proceed upon those  
Reasons? We cannot perceive the Conse-  
quence of these Things. There is no Doubt  
but they that are in Power may take Occasion  
by the Compliance of others with their  
Commands, to exert their Power in further  
extravagant Commands; But that is to be  
imputed to the *Corruption* of those that are  
in Power; and when they thus use it ill or  
unprofitably, our present Compliance with  
the *Act* of *Submission* doth now what

what is lawful in it self, cannot ~~in its own~~ Nature be interpreted to contribute to the occasional Abuse. While therefore there is nothing commanded but what we judge lawful in it self, and not hurtful to us, still we esteem our own Submission lawful, and we may take other ways to remonstrate against the Unprofitableness, the Honourable Encroachments and Abuses of Power, while it exerts it self only in Commands, that respect such Matters, as are not forbidd by the Laws of God or Man, nor bring us any real Damage; nor doth our Compliance obstruct a further Reformation neither, but only per accidens, as it may be abused to that Purpose by others.

And if we are chargeable with encouraging Impositions and hindring Reformation by our Submission, Mr. Calamy himself must be chargeable with the same. For he himself hath given an occasional Compliance with some of them, and a stated Compliance with others. He endeavours indeed to wipe himself clear, and denys that Occasional Conformity does encourage Impositions, because he does not thereby ~~win~~ their Power, but only ~~shew~~ his Charity. Neither do we by our constant Compliance necessarily own their Power, or the Extent of it to such and such things, but ~~shew~~ their Perniciousness. The Truth

Truth is, neither he or we do *really encourage* any undue Impositions, present or future, by complying with the Commands of our Governours in lawful Things; but he, no more than we, can hinder their *taking Encouragement* thereby. We have declar'd as freely against the Continuance of some Impositions, as he; yet for all that he *judgeth* our *Submission*, to what we think lawful, doth *encourage* them: on the same Account his *charitable Compliance* with the Impositions, which he would have remov'd, is judged by our *Congregational Brethren* to be an *Encouragement* likewise thereof. He may see plainly therefore how vain the Argument is, by whomsoever urg'd, against his or our *Compliance* in this Matter, that some may *take Encouragement* thereby to continue the Impositions, when there is no *Encouragement* *really given*.

And hath not Mr. Calamy himself likewise a *stated Compliance* with some Impositions? Hath not he himself *submitted* to as great an *Imposition*, as any other whatsoever, in order to the *legal Exercise* of his *Ministry*, *viz.* a *Subscription to 36 Articles*, by which he doth as much own the *Power*, and *encourage* the *Impositions*, as if he had submitted to 300, that he was equally satisfy'd in? And do not his *Brethren* do the like? Doth not he

statedly submit to an *imposed Ceremony* of Humane Invention, that whole Churches have declar'd against in other Countries, & every time he takes an Oath, by touching the Evangelists, and kissing the Book; by which Ceremony he signifies his asserting the Truth of what he swears, as he believes the Truth of the Gospel? Of which see more in our 2d. *Def.* Now if he thinks it blame worthy *in us* to submit to Impositions, for fear of encouraging a further Progress therein, Why has he *himself* done it? These Things did certainly deserve his Consideration; and if he does not afford us one Word of Answer, our Argument will be thought to have more in it, than he was willing to trouble himself about.

But there is another Thing, that he objects against our *Submission* to Impositions in lawful Things, *That if we submit to the present Impositions, 'tis hard to know where we shall stop;* which he stands to, *Letter p. 306.* this we had answer'd 2d. *Def.* p. 86. We shew'd him what Care the Church had taken to prevent the Danger he alledges; and yet if any new Impositions are made, we are under no Obligation to comply with them, till we have examin'd them, and are satisfy'd in the Lawfulness and Expediency of our Submission; and that thereupon we are as free

## of Ministerial Conformity. 13

as he. This he denieth, because we own the Power of the Church to decree lawful Things, which he does not. But does not he own a Power to impose in Church-Affairs, if Subscription to imposed Articles be an owning such a Power, as in us he supposeth it is? It is difficult indeed to fix or state the Bounds of Power, and therefore, as we said before, we think it safest to submit; and in some Cases, if there were no Power, or an Invasion of Power, we should notwithstanding comply, and so we think should he too, for Peace-sake; till the Damage that comes thereby were no further supportable. And if any thing be imposed upon him or us, which he or we judge lawful in all its Circumstances to be done, then is he as much oblig'd to comply as we, being under the same Law of Obedience to Governours; and if any thing be imposed on us or Him, which we or he judge not lawful in all its Circumstances to be done, then are we no more oblig'd thereto than he; and this is what we meant by being as free as he.

That which we have said in this Matter is this: That when we declare our Assent and Consent to the Use of Things imposed, supposing them lawful, we are not bound thereby to declare for the Imposing them, to approve of it, or assent and consent to it.

I shall now conclude this, with telling Mr. Calamy one short Story of a Matter, that hath happened of late. "There was a certain Person, a Master of a Family, who call'd to his Son, a Young-man of about one or two and twenty, to read a Chapter in the Bible. The Young-man, it seems, had white Gloves on his Hands, when he came to read. The Father bids him put off his white Gloves. The Son refuseth; he saw no Harm in them: The Father insists upon it. At last, I think, the Son comply'd so far as to pull off one; but that did not satisfie the Father, who after a short time goes to a Minister, and desires him to reprove and instruct his Son, "Why, saith the Minister, Is your Son a Drunkard, or one that takes bad Courses? "Oh no, saith the Father, he is a very honest sober Young-man. Why, what then, saith the Minister? Then the Father tells him the Story of his Obstinacy before related. The Minister upon this took the Son's Part, and defended his Refractoriness and Refusal, and being a Friend of Mr. Calamy's, chid the Father for his Impolition; for if this, saith he, be allow'd, it will destroy Mr. Calamy's Introduction. Now we will appeal to Mr. Calamy, whether this Minister was a good Calvinist or no. For our Hand is upon that upon we are parts

parts we should have chid and reprov'd the Father for his *humoursome Command* (unless he had just Reasons for it, which we know not) and the Son for his *humoursome Disobedience*, though perhaps we should incur the Displeasure of both thereby, as it commonly falls out in such Cases. This is indeed a negative Instance, in imposing a Forbearance of some things that another has a Mind to, and of his Refusal of Submission: but whether it be positive or negative, Imposition is Imposition still; and the Non-compliance in one Case or another is much alike in the Nature of the Thing: And we shall leave Mr. Calamy to apply it,

2dly, Concerning the Declaration we consider further, That as the Assent and Consent is to the *Use* of the Things impos'd, and not to the *Imposition*; so the *Approbation* given and imply'd therein is also only in Reference to the *Use*. We own the Act mentions the Word *Approbation* in several Places; we us'd the Word in our 1 Def. p. 22. we at large insist upon, and give an Account of it, 2 Def. p. 116, 117, 118. He had said, that *Approbation* was *not Use*. No indeed, say we, but *Approbation* contain'd in *Assent and Consent to the Use*. It

*What the  
Approbation  
is that is im-  
ply'd in the  
Assent and  
Consent.*

It is not to be suppos'd that a Man can assent and consent to the Use of a Thing, without an Approbation thereof as lawful and fit to be us'd. So that there was little Reason for that uncharitable Insinuation, with which he began upon me, Letter p. 308. You seem, saith he, to think, you did well to assent and consent and that barely to the Use of what is prescrib'd Whereas for my Part, saith he, in the Worship of God, I should not assent and consent to use what I did not approve of. As if we did otherwise: so indeed he had represented us before, as giving Assent and Consent to get into the establish'd Church, and yet to remain as dissatisfy'd with some Things, as those who for them are kept out of it; notwithstanding that we have own'd and defended, that there must be Approbation in order to Use. And therefore what he saith to Mr. Hoadly, Let. p. 374 is miserly frivolous; *The Subscription*, saith he oblig'd to a bare Use, but now say the Imposers by the Declaration, You shall declare for the Use of the Common-Prayer, &c. in such a Form of Words, as shall imply an Approbation: And yet this Assent and Consent is exprest to be to the Use just before, so that the Approbation can be but in Reference to the Use; and it is no more, nor yet in it self so much,

And we think it a strange Supposition, and manifestly unjust, when he saith in the same place, *That it was actually the Case of the old Puritans, to be content to use several things that they could not unfeignedly approve of.* By the old Puritans, we mean, as he must here, not the Nonconformists, but those Bishops and Conformable Ministers, upon whom that Name was reproachfully and publickly cast, whom for Distinction-sake he elsewhere calls, *The Conforming Puritans.* We profess our selves the Admirers, and (though unworthy) Followers of these Men; and therefore we cannot without Concern read this Reflection of Mr. Calamy upon them. In his former Book p. 122. he speaks modestly, *The old Puritans, saith he, us'd the Common Prayer, but they would never have declar'd their Approbation of the strict Imposition of it.* This was true, although nothing to the purpose; for neither are we, any more than they, call'd to approve of the strict Imposition. Nay, we freely grant, that we count the strict imposing of some things a *Burden*, because of the Quarrels, and Animosities, and Dissentions that are occasioned thereby, to the great Prejudice of Religion, and exposing us to the subtle Attempts of our Enemies: And therefore we desire rather, out of Compassion to our Brethren, and Regard to the publick Peace; and

and considering the little Advantage that there comes by the retaining of somethings; or how far short those Advantages are of the Mischiefs on the other side, which they do not counterbalance; I say, in consideration of these things, we desire rather that they might be removed: But then, to say that the Puritans us'd what they did not approve of, is to cast a worse Reflection upon them, than ever their sharpest Adversaries did. But when he useth them so, we do not wonder that he should use us after this manner; as if we gave our Assent and Consent to what we are dissatisfied with: This in our Second Defence p. 117. we think we had reason to call a Slanderous Reflection; and yet now in this Letter p. 316. he pretends to prove, and make it good upon me, in the Instance of the Office of Burial; he saith, *I know it is to be used over all, but such as die unbaptiz'd or excommunicate; and yet in the Case of some, would rather take my Horse and ride out of Town, than stay and perform the Office. I know it is to be used over all.* What does he mean when he tells me, that *I know this*? If he had never read any thing, that I had published, how could he say that *I know this*? for I might have been ignorant of it? But to tell me, *I know this*, when I have profess'd to believe, and prov'd the quite contrary,

mary, *Second Defence* p. 204. (to which he does not return one Word of Answer) is what I could not have expected from any body; and I cannot but hope that my Brethren of the Nonconformists will testify their Dislike of it. The most that can be infer'd from what I have publish'd about this matter, is, That if a Case should happen, in which I should be dissatisfy'd about the Application of this Office (in which I prov'd I was not obliged to use it) I would avoid it with as much Prudence, and little Noise, as I could. He talks of *hard Words*, and *such as he shall not stand to return*, when yet he persists still to defend his *Reflection* by a downright *false Supposition*.

In all this then, we say, that *Approbation* we allow, but it is *Approbation of the Use*, or *Approbation in reference to the Use*, that is contain'd or imply'd in the Declaration of *Affsent* and *Consent*. So far we go, and so far the old *Puritans* went in their Practices, and further than this we are not bound to go. But Mr. Calamy in the *Tenth Chapter* of his *Abridgment*, set two Pages together, viz. 503, 504. expresseth himself with relation to this Business, in Words that have another Meaning in them, viz. as if our *Affsent* and *Consent* signify'd the highest *Justification* and *Commendation* of every Point and Syllable, every

Rite

Rite and Ceremony, every Matter and Thing contain'd in the whole Book, and in every Page and Line of it; as if there could not possibly be any Alteration made in lone Word or Expression in it for the better (as he there goes on to explain himself.) This Sense and Meaning we justly rejected; and Mr. Colamy himself now owns, that he meant it only as hyperbolical. I frankly assure you, saith he, Letter pagi 315. I mention'd the Words as hyperbolical. But certainly then he ought to have given us notice thereof one way or other; or else we assure him, we never desire to learn Rhetorick from him. We always understood, that Tropes and Figures were to be so form'd, as not to be apt to deceive, and that it is in this, that they differ from downright Falsities: And we assure him, that we (and we believe many of his Readers besides) were deceived thereby. Mr. Hoadly, it is plain, thought he intended them to be literally understood: and accordingly we wrote against that Sense. And for him to tell us now, that he understood it as exceeding the Truth all the while [excedit Hyperbole verum] That he meant it as an Hyperbole, when he had been in such a high Strain of Words aggravating the Terms of Conformity; if this be fair dealing, let any Man judge; and if this be Rhetorick, it would

tempo

tempt one to say with the *Quakers*, That that Art is to lye by a Figure. If the old *Puritans* could not approve the Common-Prayer as the most complete and perfect in this Sense, it is no wonder; nor are we now bound to do it, by Mr. *Calamy's* own Concession. He grants his first Charge thus to be Figure and Flattery, and now adds, *Letter* pag. 115. All that I understood thereby was this, that the *affenting* and *consenting* to all and every thing contain'd and prescrib'd, was too much for a *Book*, that contains many things liable to just *Exception*; and that the *Ministers*, that were ejected, had good Reason to refuse such an *Affent and Consent*. A strange Dismalition of that *Hyperbolical Staff* for almost two Pages together in his *Tenth Chapter*. Is this all that he understands by it? No doubt, all those that have *Exceptions*, which to them appear just, against the use of any thing prescrib'd, are bound to refuse *Affent and Consent* to, or *Approbation* of the Use thereof. And we doubt not, but the *Ejected Ministers*, who thought they had such just *Exceptions*, acted *conscientiously* in the Refusal thereof; And this is all we plead for, That they who have no such just *Exceptions*, may declare their *Affent and Consent* to what is prescrib'd: so that the Controversie turns upon this, Whether there are any such just *Exceptions* against,



and Consent to the Use of the Offices, and all the Rites and Ceremonies prescribed therein; not to *Propositions* that are not contain'd in those Offices, nor prescrib'd for Use or Practice to us. This we have proved in our *First and Second Defence*; and it is fully explain'd and confirm'd in a printed *Letter* directed to me, part of which relating to this Matter, we have transcribed in our *Second Defence*, p. 124, &c. which we take to have great Weight in it, though Mr. *Calamy* is pleas'd to pass it by. And he has also omitted the Consideration of our Reply to many things which before he laid great Stress upon. So that we must desire the Reader to have Recourse to what we have already discoursed of these matters, for his Satisfaction therein, that we may not be guilty of needless Repetitions. And Mr. *Calamy* himself has given such an Explication of the Design and Sense of the *Declaration*, by the pretended Difference between that and the *Subscription*, in his *Letter* to Mr. *Hoadly*, p. 374. as plainly shews he thinks himself it was to the Use of the Book, and of its Offices, that it was design'd, and not to the *Propositions* &c. only he saith, That an *Apology* was also intended; which we have granted; and consider'd before, and prov'd, That it also has reference to the Use; So that we might dismiss the contested *Propositions* about the

Salvation of Infants, the three Orders of Ministers, &c. as not belonging to the Declaration, and so not concern'd in the Defence: But yet being satisfied our selves of the Truth of them, we shall consider them, as we have done, for the fuller Vindication of the Book of Common Prayer; and shall endeavour to answer the Objections that Mr. Calamy hath advanc'd with relation thereto.

There is yet one thing only remains, as an Objection against the Sense of the Declaration, which we have given, taken from the Journal of the House of Lords, which Mr. Calamy doth still much insist upon, and which, he thinks, doth clear this matter fully, and saith, *The whole Debate turns upon it.* This he now tells us, he hath search'd, though he had not inform'd us so much before, but left us only to guess from whence he had the Story: And he doth now insult us unmercifully, because at Forty Miles distance from London, we had not the Opportunity of searching the Records as well as he. Nor did we think it material, but were ready to take the Representation of the matter of Fact, which he had given us, from whomsoever he had it. Now the matter it seems, was this: A Year after the Act of Uniformity, there being a Bill sent up from the Commons to the Lords, for the Relief of some Persons that had been disabled by Sicknes or other-

wise from making the Declaration in due time, the *Lords*, among other Amendments, added a Clause in these Words, *And be it Enacted* and declared by the Authority aforesaid, *That the Declaration and Subscription of Assent and Consent in the said Act mentioned, shall be understood only, as to the Practice and Obedience to the said Act, and not otherwise.* But this could not be carried; the Clause was rejected, and the *Lords* acquiesc'd in the Rejection. And Mr. Galamy's Comment upon it is this, viz. That the Reason of the Commons, upon their Debate amongst themselves for the rejecting of the Clause was, because they would have more understood by Assenting, Consenting and Subscribing, than to the Use; that upon a Debate between the two Houses, they offer'd their Reasons to the *Lords*; and that a Majority of the *Lords* was convinc'd thereby, that more ought to be meant by the Declaration than to the Use. This Sense of things Mr. Galamy is so confident of, that, pag. 311. he saith, Give me reason for it [viz. the Matter of Fact agreed on] if you can, besides this, viz. the Comment that he had made upon it, which we have fairly represented. We accept his Challenge, and shall do that and more. We will,

1. Afford another Reason for the Rejecting that Clause by the Commons, and the *Lords* agreeing

agreeing with them in so doing. Mr. Calamy himself saith, pag. 313. *We must not look for Reasons in the Journal, either of Lords or Commons; for that is a rare thing; they enter Fact without Reasons, unless it be of late.* We believe then, that this may be a very likely Reason of the Lords' Clause, viz. that Compassion which they bore to the Nonconformists who, they observ'd, put such a hard Sense on the Declaration, as Mr. Calamy and others have since done: contrary to the true Intent and Meaning of the Law, to their own great Prejudice; and because of this, they were willing to have it declared for their satisfaction, that it should not be understood in that extensive or rigorous Sense, in which they took it; as it was not indeed the Sense of the Law it self, which did confine it to the Use of the Book only, and the things prescribed in it. And as for the Reason of the Commons rejecting that Clause, They on the other side had not that Compassion for the Nonconformists, as the moderate Peers had (as appear'd also more afterwards, by their Voting that the Comprehension-Bill prepared by Bishop Wilkins, Lord Chief Justice Hale, &c. should not so much as be brought into the House,) They were willing enough to let the Dissenters continue under their Mistake, and to let them alone to put that hard Sense upon the Declaration, without giving them any Ease therein.

nay, some of them might go so far, as not to think it for the Interest of the Church, to have that or other means us'd to bring them in; but rather that the doing so might be, in the Opinion of some Bigots, *destructive to the Church of England*. The *Commons* might also think that the Law was plain enough already; but if the Dissenters would mistake, let them mistake; their Company did not seem to them so desirable, as that there should be that Satisfaction given. It does not at all appear, that this was their own Sense of the Law, that more was meant than *to the Use*; but this was the *Nonconformists* mistake of the Sense of it, which the *Commons* were willing enough to let them alone in. And when the *Lords* could not prevail to have this Mistake clearly rectify'd, they were fain to acquiesce in what was done. But seeing how things were wrong taken, they were willing to have things set right, and the true Sense to be declar'd (as the Word is in the Clause) and Enacted; And this appearing to be their Sense then the next year, they being a standing Body, it is justly presumable, that it was their Sense too at the first enacting; And so it might be of the *Commons* too, for any thing that Mr. *Calamy* has shewn to the contrary; which sufficiently overthrows Mr. *Calamy's* Comment or Conclusion; for when another

Reason or *likely Cause* can be assign'd of an Act, it is sufficient to overthrow the Pre-  
tence of the *Necessity* of that which is as-  
sign'd: for a Necessity can never consist with  
a contrary Likelihood or Probability, which  
in this Matter, we have fairly suggested. And  
if we only say, that for any thing that ap-  
pears to the contrary, That may be the Rea-  
son which we have given of the Commons  
rejecting the Clause mention'd; and That  
may not be the Reason which Mr. Calamy has  
given, then is his Argument from it utterly  
lost; so that the only certain way of deciding  
this Matter is to come at last to the Con-  
texture of the Law it self, and to that we  
appeal. But as we said, we shall do more  
than this, *viz.*

2. Make it appear, that it is very highly  
improbable that his Comment should be true;  
(viz, that the Commons should be sway'd by  
certain Reasons, to judge, that there ought  
to be meant by this Declaration than to the  
*Use*;) and then should produce those Reasons  
to the *Lords*, and convince a Majority of  
them thereby;) for if such Reasons were  
given, they must have all these Properties;  
They must be very weighty and strong, be-  
cause they convinc'd the *Lords* and chang'd  
their Minds: They must be very open and  
*publick*, being first debated in the House of  
Commons,

Commons, then delivered to the *Lords*, and then again debated amongst them: They must, lastly, be of general *Concern*; Multitudes of Persons without Doors being nearly concern'd therein. Now though *Reasons* (as he faith) were not entred into the *Journal* in those *Days*, as of late; yet we say, it is highly improbable that *Reasons* of so general a *Concern*, and so publickly debated, should be forgotten and utterly obliterated out of the Minds of Men, if such there were. Could such *Reasons* be brought forth, which convinc'd the *Lords*, they might possibly also convince us; at least there would be some found, who would have urg'd them, as being themselves convinc'd thereby. But when we ask'd, *Why they made no Proselytes without Doors, &c?* He answers, Letter p. 313. *We put him to it* ..... *He does not think himself oblig'd to account for the Matter*, he will leave us to guess. But if no Cause can be assigned, why such pretended *Reasons*, suppos'd to be of such *Weight* in themselves, of such *Concern* to many, and so publick with all, should be immediately and utterly stifled, and no Book written againt them, or in Defence of them, when the Controversie about the Declaration was begun from the very first; Then it is highly probable that no such *Reasons* were given for the Equity

of any other Sense, than what was present-  
ly accounted and pleaded for, by Dr. Ful-  
wood and others, and has been so constantly  
since.

But though Mr. Calamy does not ~~think~~  
himself concern'd to account for this Matter,  
yet presently after, p. 314. he puts in his  
guess; That no one ever appear'd against the  
Sense of Fulwood, Falkner, Stillingfleet, and  
Sherlock, because they would leave it to Men  
of our Sense to draw Persons into the Church, &c.  
and so they combin'd together to stifle the  
Reasons of the Commons for the other Sense,  
that there appear not the least Footsteps of  
them. *Credat Judex Apella.*

But, first, Did they draw the Nonconfor-  
mists into this Conspiracy too? Those good  
Men were concern'd for their own Sakes well  
to weigh such Reasons (if such there had  
been) as convinc'd the Lords of the Equi-  
ty of that Sense, that they themselves were  
inclin'd to suppose the Declaration had. And  
if they could not have been convinc'd by  
them, they would have told us, how to an-  
swer them, and have shew'd us wherein they  
were inconclusive; but now for 40 Years and  
more there is a profound Silence in this Mat-  
ter. And then for the Conformists, whom he  
would suppose combin'd craftily to let the  
Sense

Sense of Fulwood and the Rest pass for genuine, by suppressing the *Commons Reasons*, that they might draw in us; he has utterly forgot a Principle, that when it was for his Turn, he laid down, *viz.* That those High Men were so far from such a cunning Contrivance to bring us in, that they were rather desirous to have kept us out. He tells us, *Mod. Non.* part 2. p. 105. That this was the firm Persuasion of them that had the Power, that such Persons, as were against the imposing things indifferent, and for the bare using them, &c. were better out of the Church, than in it. Would they then have made such a strange Attempt, as to stifle the *Commons Reasons*, to let Fulwood's Sense pass, on purpose to bring them in, that they were firmly perswaded were better out than in. Indeed we are not so uncharitable to speak as he does, concerning those indefinitely that had the Power; but we fear, some such there were; Yet have none of these cross Men produc'd the *Commons Reasons* in Anger against Fulwood's and Falkner's Sense; nor have any of better Temper produc'd them out of good Will, to draw others to the Opinion they espoused, as is natural for Men to do. If then Reasons suppos'd to be of so general Concern do no where appear, it is even morally impossible, they should have been so publickly

publickly debated; and consequently, that the Lords should have been convinc'd thereby; and therefore that the Clause was not drop'd by the Lords upon any such Conviction which was the Thing that was to be proved.

We proceed now to the Passages excepted against in the Liturgy.

¶ I. The first is of the *Salvation and Regeneration of Infants baptiz'd*. But this Head, he saith, doth not need many Words; And why then should we make any more Discourse about it? We understand this of such *Infants*, as do belong to God's *Covenant*, and have a Right to baptism, and we can't imagin, that the Church should understand it, or that we ought to understand it of any other. And Mr. *Calamy* does not at all disprove our Sense, or prove that we ought to take it in any other Sense. And he grants and agrees with us, that such *dying*, without actual violating the *Covenant*, are saved. And that *Baptism* is a *Sign of Regeneration or the New birth*. He saith, *He is clear with us in*. And he does not oppose the taking the Passages objected against in the Offices in that *sacramental Sense*. And what have we then more to dispute about? Why, he thinks, it doth not become one concern'd for *Reformation*,

to justify an Expression, that tempts Multitudes to fancy, that it is clear, by the Word of God, that Infants are certainly sav'd, if they are but baptiz'd. Why, what would he have us to do? Here is an Expression, that hath a sound and very true Sense belonging to it; and we cannot, we ought not to take it in any other Sense: And why may we not explain that Sense then? And why may we not justify it so explain'd? Or why is this inconsistent with a Concern for Reformation? What if some People fancy an odd Sense in it, and we go about to prevent their Misconstruction of it? Doth not this shew we are concern'd for Reformation? Yes, and we would be glad to have the Rubrick more explain'd or unexceptionably express'd, or quite taken away, for the sake of those that scruple it; though at the same time we are abundantly satisfied of the true Intent and Meaning of it. We would let Mr. Calamy know, we are for Reformation as well as he; we desire it, we long after it. But in the mean time, May we not subscribe (supposing this Rubrick were to be subscriber'd) to a good and sound Proposition, as we do and must understand it? And may we not defend it, when we have done, because some People misunderstand it? We can't tell what Mr. Calamy means by such Discourse! And yet if

if the Point were as doubtful as he would suppose, we have told Mr. Calamy, and prov'd it, that neither is our *Subscription* or *Declaration* concern'd in it: it being a *Proposition* in a *Rubrick*, and not a *Part* of any *Office* to be *used* by us.

He hath the same Exception as before, against the Passages about *Regeneration* in the *Office of Baptism*, because it tempts Men to think, that no further *Regeneration* is needful. Well, and we are as free as he, to have those Expressions changed, or further explain'd, to prevent any such Abuse or Misconstruction of them; if any such there be, as possibly there may. But yet Mr. Calamy does not now contend with us, but that these Expressions may be understood likewise in a very sound Sense, in which we all agree: And why then, May we not subscribe them, and assent to the Use of them in that Sense, and when we are no way bound to do it in any other? And is it not evident, that we do not use them as applicable to all, but only to those to whom we think the *Office* it self belongs, viz. such as are *Church-Members*, to all whom the many *Scriptures* that we quoted in our 2d. *Defence* apply these and the like Expressions; and Mr. Calamy is not able to shew in any one Instance that we have mis cited any *Scripture*, or apply'd it in any wrong

Meaning or Manner. How then do we ~~mean~~ teach any thing that we should teach, when we use these Expressions only, as they *may* be us'd, and as the Scripture useth them? And why must we bear the Blame of every *accidental* Mischief, that may ensue upon the Abuse and Misconstruction thereof, and not from the *Nature* of the thing in its true and right Sense; especially when we take all possible Care, upon proper Occasions, to prevent the Misunderstanding or Misuse thereof? Mr. Calamy forceth us to use more Words than we need to do in this Matter, by such hard Insinuations.

2. The next Head is, of the Use of Godfathers and Godmothers in Baptism. Upon this head is more large. He pretends to shew the Difference between Godfathers in other Churches and in ours; because they do not make the Declaration of the Covenant to which the Child stands bound amongst them, as they do amongst us: He saith, that *that* which they cast on Godfathers was not to covenant for the Children: neither do we cast any such thing upon them; nor did we bring it to prove a Parallel in any such thing: but that which we brought in the Comparison for, is, that if they do not exclude the Parents from their Right, then neither do we; for as to that

that the Agreement holds, and this is all we brought it for. It is true, He denies it, and saith, *Letter p. 320.* How Bishop Morley could say, that in the Church of England, Parents are not forbidden to present their Children to Baptism, when the Canons so plainly forbid it, he cannot imagine. To which we reply, that nevertheless Bishop Morley did say it, and he was one of the Great Imposters; and knew the Mind of the rest as much as any Man; even the very Man in the Secret; and this Man asserts, that the Parents are not excluded. And now that the Canon forbids it, and plainly forbids it, is one of those things that we want a Name for. It does not indeed suffer them to be Godfathers (for theirs is a distinct Province). And it saith, that the Fathers shall not be urg'd to be present, as if their Presence were of Necessity, that without it the Children could not be baptized (for so it is not). But it does not forbid them to present their Children to Baptism, as Bishop Morley expresseth it; but they are bound to do so, by desiring the Ministers to baptize their Children, charging the Godfathers to represent their Children in the Administration of the Ordinance; and by the inward Acts of Faith and Prayer to dedicate their Children to God therein.

As to Godfathers becoming Covenanted Sponsors,

Sponsors, (as he expresseth it) he does renew his Accusations against them, as if they were intended to bind the Children, and to secure the Blessings for them. But this we deny'd to be dont in our Office, and so do still: and to our large Discourse thereof, and our Proof from *Private Baptism*, in which the Children are bound to the Duties, and the Blessings are seal'd to them, without Godfathers; that therefore they are not brought for those Ends, or to do those things for the Children, but for other Ends by us at large set down in our *2d. Defence*; to all this, I say, we can pick out but two Things pretended as an Answer.

The one is, That supposing Sponsors were design'd for the Use he pretends, she should have expressed it fully, to secure the Blessings of the Covenant, and bind to the Duties of it; yet, saith he, there would be no need of them in *private Baptism*, in Case of Sickness and Danger of Death. But this is gratis dictum with a Witness: for if this were the Use of Sureties to secure the Blessings of the Covenant to the Children (as the Course of his Argument should have run) then were there most need of them in *Private Baptism*, and in Danger of Death; because they stood in absolute need of those Blessings, upon their Entrance into an unchangeable State. If Godfathers were design'd

design'd (as his Charge is expressed, Letter p. 319.) to convey to Children the Gospel Blessings, they could least of all be spar'd in Danger of Death. But he will needs put a Sense upon the Churches Office, that is and hath been disown'd, and which we have fairly argu'd against, and can by no means see that ever it was intended as the End thereof; and then he quarrels against it. For Godfathers according to him, must be for this and this Purpose, whether the Church will or no; and then he ridicules the Office upon his own groundless Supposition. We have produc'd from Dr. Burgess, That the Interrogatories in Baptism, made to, and answer'd by the Godfathers, are only an Adumbration of that Stipulation, which is really entred into by receiving the Sacrament of Baptism it self. And that this was approv'd as the Church's Sense by King James, the then Bishop of Winchester and the Archbishop. To which he answers, that however he does not see, that the doing of this in such a way, is either to be justify'd or accounted for. But whether it be to be justify'd or accounted for; whether the Matter design'd be expressed so well as it should be; or whether it might not be in another Manner better; that is not the Question, we shall discourse something of the presently: But the Question is, Whether the

men are not the *Sense of the Church*. We have pro-  
Bless'd both Authorities and Reasons for it, which  
Damsore cannot see but that they hold good, notwithstanding his Exceptions. And if this be  
the *Sense of the Church*, all the rest is a meer  
Quarrel about Words and Forms of speaking,  
which we shall never contend about, but wish  
and rather that they might be chang'd, and made  
more inexceptionable, for the sake of those  
that are dissatisfy'd with these: When once  
the *Sense of the Office* is secur'd, the wording  
hereof is of much lesser Concern.

The other thing therefore we take notice  
of in his Answer, is a shameless Comparison  
God between the Responses made in the Name of  
St. John Child, and those made in the Name of the  
dead by the Marcionites. He saith, *The one*  
*is very near as odd as the other.* And again,  
*it is much the same.* Whereas the fundamen-  
tal Difference between the one and the other,  
is most apparent. The dead Bodies are not  
capable of entring into Covenant with God;  
and therefore to make a Declaration of a Co-  
ovenant between God and them, was wicked  
and absurd; but a Child is capable of being  
brought into Covenant, and is actually brought  
in thereinto, and therefore the Covenant may  
be declar'd both in the Lord's Name, and in  
the Child's, which is there by Baptism seal'd.  
and when he saith, *We are hard put to it,*

when we say that Children are bound by their own Promise and Covenant-Engagement, which their Sureties only declar'd; and that to found Infant-Baptism upon Promises or Covenant-Engagements of Infants, declar'd by their Sureties, is to betray it. It is plain, we do not found Infant-Baptism upon this Declaration for then there could be no Private Baptism without Sureties, if that were the Foundation of their being baptiz'd: But Second Defence pag. 145. we plainly declar'd the Foundation of Infant-Baptism to be, God's gracious Promise to Believers, and their Seed, by which he comprehends their Children in the Band of the Covenant; and a Capacity on their part to be brought into a Covenant-Engagement and Obligation, And this we say is actually done in Baptism; and our Meaning is then most plainly express'd, that the Childrens Promise, or Covenant-Obligation is declar'd by their Sureties which represent them there.

But it is that one Response especially, that he judgeth not proper, and does indeed ridicule, viz. That the Godfather should answer to the Question, *Wilt thou be baptiz'd &c?* in these Words, *That is my desire.* To which we reply; The End of Words is to be the Expressions and Signs of our Minds and the Determination of their Signification is by Custom and Agreement amongst Men

So that tho' there are various Uses of the same Words or Forms of Speech, yet when the Sense of our Words is determined by Custom, and they are not apt to deceive, or to be chang'd into any other Sense by the Hearers than what we intend, then do they answer all the Ends of Speech. To apply this; When Infants have a Claim to any Privilege amongst Men, Custom has determined that their Council or lawful Attorneys do declare their Claim in Court; and they do it in the first Person thus; *I desire, or, We desire to be admitted* [suppose into some Copy-hold, or the like] the Sense is known and determined, that they by that Form of Words desire, that the Child should be admitted. So here, the plain Meaning thereof is (saith Dr. Falkner lib. Eccl. pag. 279.) to express that the Intent of the Child's being present, is to receive Baptism, which upon its Account, and in its Right and Name, they desire for it. And these Words, by Custom amongst Men for many Ages, being significant of our Minds, are not apt to deceive, nor is there likely to be any Damage thereby through Mistake of their Meaning: They are indeed a Metonymie, but not like Mr. Calamy's Hyperbole, before-spoken of, in his 10th Chapter, that none, that we know of, ever guess'd to be so meant, till he told us so two years after. The Sense of these

Words is so plain and determined, that the meanest Countryman knows that he does thereby desire *Baptism* for the *Child*: And Mr. *Calamy* cannot so much as insinuate any wrong Sense, or other Sense, that any could be apt to put upon them. St. *Augustine* wrote part of his 23 Epist. on this Question, *Quo modo Susceptores in Baptismo respondeant, illorum credere cum parvuli revera non credant, & incertum sit, an sint credituri?* We know he will presently reject the Authority of the Fathers, but this he cannot withstand, that here is sufficient time from St. *Augustine*'s days for Custom to make the Words significant of what is intended thereby; if Men will contend (it is that Father's Similitude in the above-cited Epistle) that we do not speak properly, when upon a *Lord's-day*, we say *This Day our Lord arose from the Dead*, whereas he arose many years ago, he would object [in epistle] foolishly, seeing our Words are no apt to deceive, but are fully understood by the Hearers; I only add, as he also does it that Epistle; *Respondi sicut existimo, quantum attinet ad minus capaces, & ad contentiosos non satis; quantum ad pacatos & intelligentes, plus forte quam sat est.* As to the Abuses caus'd by wicked and careless Godfathers, we declar'd against them and said, That the same Abuses might be abrogated.

where there be no Godfathers; wicked Parents would be wicked and unnatural to their Children, &c. Second Defence p. 157. This he denies, and saith, Letter p. 323. We have no such Abuses amongst us Dissenters, who admit no Godfathers. To which we only say, Amen. We wish from our Hearts he could prove it.

3. We came next to the exclusive Terms of Communion. We had told him, that they respect all Determinations of Circumstances in Worship, which others scruple. As to his own Instances of the Forms of Singing, some sort of Officers, &c. in the Dissenting Churches, he had by way of Prolepsis insinuated, That in such Cases they had the Liberty of repairing to other Churches, which, in Case of National Impositions, could not be granted. We had also reply'd, That this Answer could hold only as to great Cities, where there are many dissenting Churches; and not as to Places, where there are no other dissenting Congregations within many Miles: And we might add, if they go those many Miles, they may find the same Determinations (suppose, of the scrupled Form of Singing, &c.) and then they are likely to be debarr'd accidentally by such Exclusive Terms amongst them, as

Of exclusive  
Terms of  
Communion,  
with respect  
to Baptism.

well as amongst us. He can now add no further Answer than this *Letter*, p. 325. that the scrupulous Person *has the Liberty* of removing his *Habitation*, which he can have no Benefit by, in Case of a *National Constitution*. Whereas in hundreds of Cases, it would be as much Ruine for some scrupulous Persons to remove their Dwellings, upon which their Trade and Livelihood depends, to far distant Habitations in other Towns; as it would be for others to remove, beyond the Bounds of a *National Church*, into another Land.

What he saith further on this Head, is That he cannot discern this, and he cannot discern that. *He cannot discern that our Constitution gives a Man Liberty to use the Form of private Baptism*, when Persons scruple Godfathers. What have we here to answer? There is no Reply to be made to his *not discerning*. He saith, when the *Diocesan* gives *Allowance* to baptize a *Child privately*, he agreeth it may be *justify'd*, though *Sureties* are omitted: but that it is otherwise allowable, he cannot discern. But could the *Diocesan* give this *Allowance*, if the *Constitution* did not allow it? If it may be *justify'd* by the *Allowance* of the *Diocesan*, it may be *justify'd* by the *Allowance* of the *Law*, which the *Diocesan* is no more allowed to dispence with than any *Private Minister*. When an Application

is made to a *Bishop* in such a Case, it is to obtain his Direction and *Judgment*, what the Intent of the Law may be; not to get a *Dispensation* from him contrary to the Law. If the Law it self be contrary, it is not his Allowance will justify the Act. This *Concession* of Mr. *Calamy* doth in all Reason make for the *Concession* of the Law it self in such a Case.

As to the baptizing Children therefore privately, whose Parents scruple some Rites, we still affirm, that we are fully empowered by the *Rubrick* so to do. He saith again, *No*; because the *Rubrick* confines us to Children that are *Sick* and *in Danger of Death*, without pretending to answer the plain Proof that we brought to the contrary: yet does he urge something new to prove such a Confinement, which is a late *Representation* of the *Lower House of Convocation*; wherein they say, that the *unjustifiable Use of Private Baptism* has lessen'd the Reverence due to that *Holy Office*, occasioned the *mutilating the Form*, &c. This Authority he several times refers us to. We will not question the Authority of this *Representation*, nor repeat what *Bp. Burnet* saith of it, in his *Charge*, at his *Triennial Visitation*, A. 1704. p. 10. But we will suppose it made by that *whole House*, and to have with it the *Concurrence of the Bishops*,

and to have then the *Royal Assent*, and, to please Mr. Calamy, a new *Act of Parliament* to back it, and even then it would not in the least oppose our Assertion. They declare against the *unjustifiable use of Private Baptism* (as it is well known there is great Occasion for Complaints) But do they say, that there is no Reason *justifiable* for Private Baptism but *Sickness and Danger of Death*? Or do they so much as insinuate any such thing? They know, and we have prov'd that there are divers other *justifiable* Reasons for it, 2d. *Def.* p. 167. to which agrees a Passage in Bp. Burnet's *Charge* before-named, p. 11. *In Baptism, we ought not to comply with the Vanity of those, who desire to baptize in their Houses, as a Mark of Distinction; but we ought to consider Distance, and a hard Season; chiefly where Danger may be apprehended to the Child; for in those Cases, God will have Mercy and not Sacrifice.* Here are other Reasons for *Private Baptism* besides *Sickness and Danger of Death*; and we are to consider them, as being indeed the sole Judges of the *urgent Cause* mention'd in the *Rubrick*. And doth the *Representation* say, that the Reason by us alledged for *Private Baptism*, is not a *justifiable* one? But perhaps he will say, they count the *Form mutilated*, if the Child be not afterwards brought to Church with

with Godfathers, &c. Well and good, but what if the Parents that scruple these Rituals, refuse to bring their Children to Church, (knowing that they are declar'd to be *fully and sufficiently baptiz'd*) and do not think it expedient for them so to do (though the Church does) Can we *compel* them so to do? No, by no Means; which is what we said before in this Matter, to which we refer the Reader, and desire him to judge between us.

4. As to the *Sign of the Cross*, Of the Use  
of the Sign of  
the Cross. He saith again, *He will not say* it is *simply unlawful*, yet in a few flouting Words he continues his

Charge against it, as if it were unlawful; so that it is hard to know where to find him. *If*, saith he, *the Sign of the Cross be a Sign of Christ's Merits*, he should be hard put to it to conceive, to what Purpose the Sign of those Merits should, under that Notion, be apply'd to one that had not the thing signify'd secur'd [and convey'd, as he presently after adds] if there were a due Disposition of the Recipient. Under what Notion does he mean, that this Sign is us'd by us? Under the Notion of Christ's Merits offer'd to us, or under the Notion of Christ's Merits gloried in by us? nothing is more evident than that the latter is meant by our Use, and not the former. And what Relation is there between a Sign

a Sign of Christ's Merits, or Christ crucify'd, glorify'd in by us (which is our Act and Deed) and the securing and conveying those Merits (which is only God's Work) where there is a *Disposition in the Recipient*? A Recipient supposeth an *Offer* of something to be receiv'd, so it is in the Sacraments; And if a *Humane Sacrament* be made (as amongst the Papists) something is suppos'd to be therein offer'd, and so thereby convey'd and secur'd: which Supposition, we prove against them, to be highly evil and affronting; because we can no more appoint what *Signs* God should convey and secure his Grace and the Merits of his Son by, than we can our selves convey and secure them. But the *Glorying in Christ's Merits* is *our Work*, and the *Signs* thereof belong to *us*, by Words and Actions. And so the *Primitive Christians* us'd this Sign; nor had they any other Sense of it that ever we heard of: To be sure the Meaning of it is ascertained amongst us, because it is always express in the Use of it, *in token that the Baptiz'd shall not be ashame'd, &c.* He again mentions *Hooker* and *Comber*, without any regard to our Answer, and our References to Dr. *Whitby* for a yet larger one. As for Bp. *Taylor*, he was a most uncertain Writer, and faith as much against *Infant-Baptism* as against this Rite. For Answer to him, we refer

refer to the large Scripture Warrant for the Use of such Signs in our ad. Def. p. 49, &c. to Bishop King's Appendix to his Admonition (which is the plainest Book we ever saw upon this Subject, highly worth perusal) and shall content our selves with a Quotation out of Bishop Burnet's Sermon since the writing our last Defence, which is joind to his Charge, A. 1704. in p. 44. Having spoken of the Prejudices against Kneeling at the Lord's-Supper, He adds, *That against the Cross in Baptism is as weak, that because Papists use the Cross as a sort of a Charm, and fancy there is a Divine Virtue accompanying, therefore we, by using it, comply with that Superstition, and fortify it. They use the Cross before Baptism, as an Exorcism to drive away the evil Spirit; and this supposeth a divine Power accompanying a humane Institution, which makes it to be of the Nature of a Sacrament.* Whereas we use it after Baptism, not as having any Virtue ty'd to it, but only as a Declaration of the Faith we profess; so that it is only a way of speaking by a Gesture or Action, and has nothing ascribed to it, that is in any sort sacramental.

Thus far that Bishop. We shall only make a little Addition to the many parallel Signs, which we have clear'd up this Matter by in our former Books. Mr. Calamy hath lately put forth a new Edition of an excellent Book of

one of the ejected Ministers; in that, is the Form of covenanting with God, which hath been of Use, we believe, to many hundreds of Souls; after which are these Words. *This Covenant I advise you to make, not only in Heart but in Word; not only in Word but in Writing; and that you would with all possible Reverence spread the Writing before the Lord, as if you would present it to him as your Act and Deed.* And when you have done this, set your Hand to it. Keep it as a Memorial of the solemn Transactions that have passed between God and you, that you may have Recourse to it in Doubts and Temptations. Here we have,

1. Not one dedicating Sign only, but several; here is Christ crucify'd accepted and closed with upon Terms there mention'd, and the Signs are, writing down the Form; then spreading it before the Lord, as presenting the Writing to God, as the Covenanters Act and Deed. Then after that, is the putting the Hand to it.

2. The exciting Signification, &c. afterwards, which is expres'd by keeping it for a Memorial, having Recourse to it in Doubts and Temptations. Let this be compar'd with what Mr. Hooker and Dr. Comber say of the Sign in Controversy. We mention these things so distinctly, because it has been

of great Service to remove the Prejudices against this Sign, to observe how familiarly and with what Profit many other Signs of the like Nature have been, and are still used by us.

5. In speaking to the *excluding them that do not kneel* from the Lord's-Supper, amongst other things which we largely insisted on, and to which he gives no Answer, We prov'd from Bishop Morley, that the *Rubrick* does not exclude them. That Bishop expressly saith, that Mr. Baxter's Argument (which Mr. Calamy has taken up) was deny'd as belonging to the *Canons* and not to the *Common-Prayer*. Now to answer us, he also quotes Bp. Morley, who, he tells us, saith, that *our Law admits not such as do not kneel*, and gives this Reason; because *they break the Orders of the Church*. And then he *brags* that we are condemned by Bp. Morley, whom we quoted. For our parts, we think it not worth the while to look, whether Bp. Morley saith so or no; for it no ways affects what we cited from him. No doubt the *Orders of the Church* require *Kneeling*, and that the *Canon-Law* excludes them that do not. But Bp. Morley tells us (contrary to what he had asserted of the *Men or Man in the secret*) that the *Liturgy* does

of excluding  
from the  
Lord's-Supper  
those that  
dare not kneel.

does not exclude them, tho' the Canon does so that by his Leave we are far from being condemned by Bp. Morley, to whom we appeal'd. Then he flies out; *Let the Hardship arise from the Canon or the Liturgy, it is much at one to Him; if the Canon be not part of the Liturgy, it is a part of the Constitution, &c.* But hold, Sir, it is not much at one to us, if it be to you. For if this *Exclusion of them, that do not kneel, had been by the Liturgy, then had we been required to Assent and Consent to it* (as your Charge runs) But if it be only by the Canon, (to which we are not call'd to give our Assent and Consent) then, according to your self, we are not obliged to it, till it becomes the Command of our particular *Bishop*; nor then neither, unless in that Particular in which he commands it, we judge it to be *lawful and honest*. Pray, Sir, Why so hard to receive a plain Answer?

But, saith Mr. Calamy, *If they who afterwards made sundry Alterations and Amendments, had not intended that the Rubrick should be interpreted by the Canon, they would have altered the Rubrick.* But they having not done this, it is plain, that it was design'd, such as would not kneel should be excluded. Now this is no Consequence at all. Supposing that they were never so much for obliging the Minister

give the Sacrament to none but those that kneel, (as perhaps some of them were) and that they who would not kneel should be excluded; yet it does not follow that they thought the *Rubrick* did oblige them to exclude them; But it was the *Canon* which they depended upon, which had a *Penalty* annexed thereto, and which the *Governours* might make use of, as they saw good, in their *Administration*; the *Rubrick* in the mean time laying no such *Obligation* upon them. If they had not intended this *Exclusion* indeed, they might have vacated the *Canon* which obliged to it: but their Intention of the Continuances of this *Exclusion*, is no Argument of their Intention that the *Rubrick* should be interpreted (as he calls it, or rather enlarged) by the *Canon*) it was sufficient that the *Canon* it self did require it, though the *Rubrick* did not do it. But whether it be *Prudence* in a *Minister*, that does not think this *Canon* will excuse him before God in doing what is there enjoyn'd, to run upon the *Canon's Mouth*, is Mr. *Calamy's Wit*, is another Matter of Dispute; and belongs to another place, in which it is professedly treated of. *Prudence* requires the comparing a great many Circumstances together, and then making a Determination accordingly; it is sufficient for our present Purpose, that it is not that which

which comes within our Subscription or Declaration of Assent and Consent.

Of the Three Orders of Ministry.

6. We came next to the Three Orders of Ministers. Mr. Calamy insinuates, as if we thought our selves not obliged to own them. Whereas we say, that our Assent and Consent respects not that Rubrick, which saith *There were always such since the Apostles times*. We do indeed believe there have been Three such Orders in the Church of Christ all along at least, in some particular Churches where they have been all needed; but we are not called to give our Assent and Consent there unto, or to the Nature of their Distinction and Powers; but to the Form of the Ordination of those that are called to those Three Orders amongst us, and that that may Lawfully be used. And how are we out in this, unless he could prove that it was contained in our Declaration, which he does not go about to do; and we have sufficiently prov'd the contrary? He saith, Mr. Baxter was for Arch Bishops above Bishops, but not for Bishops above Presbyters, that had but part of the Pastoral Power. And yet he is not for disputing about Words and Phrases. We assent that the Presbyters of the Church of England have the Pastoral Power that Christ left them; and we shew'd him that Mr. Baxter asserted the same

Def. p. 110. So that those whom Mr. Baxter calls *Bishops*, we call *Presbyters*; and three whom he calls *Archbishops*, we call *Bishops*; although Mr. Baxter frequently useth the *same Phrases* that we do. But how lean an *own Answer* is this to our *Defence*?

7. About the Office of Burial, Of the Office  
of Burial.

Mr. Calamy saith, *He can say no more than what he has said, and three we have done with it too.* But long he has again recourse to the Canon; which here we allow in those *Instances* as to which it is not *lawfully apply'd* in the Administration of the here Government; but if *wrongfully apply'd*, (as and all human Laws are capable of being) it is in that *wrong Application* no part of the Canon *Or Ordination*; nor are we more concern'd therein, full in Point of Conscience, than he is. We give unless our *Assent* to the Office, and to the Use of it, in where it may be used, and that is all. We do give no *Assent* to the Canon, though in whole the *Instances* in which it is rightly apply'd, we do not censure it neither do And if it should fall us out, that we should incur any Danger thereby, it is not only Impeachment of our Conformity, but a mere *Hardship*, that may fall the our in any Government. Mr. Calamy saith there, *We have not sufficiently answer'd his Story.* Let the Reader judge. We are apt to think, if he had had us at any Advantage, he

would not have past it so. We are not so encouraging *Presumption* thereby, nor do we think that we do do it. But as added *Defender of the Church*, as he takes me to be, there is more in our Discourse about this matter than he thinks fit to answer. And so we must leave it.

Of the Rule  
to find out  
Easter.

8. Concerning the Rule to find out our Easter-day; we asserted the our Assent and Consent concerning it not; and he never offers to disprove it, but we are nevertheless very clear in its being a good Rule, when rightly understood. And we think we made it clear in our Second Defence (p. 224, &c.) that very School-boy might understand it; and he does not offer anyone Word of Reply, but saith *Esse* *Esse* p. 324. When we have taken notice of much Pain to help People to understand the Rule, it is so true sometimes it is not so always. We wonder at him, he cannot forbear laying the scherching, though it be nothing to the purp'le. The Rule must hold always; and exactly answer to our Easter-day, because Easter-day is every Year to according to that Rule; observing the Computation of new and full Moon to be four or five days later than they are in the Heavens; as in our first Month it days later. See Dr. Wallis's Discourse of the Sabbath p. 17. The 14th day of the first Month (so call'd *Exod. 12. 6. Ezra 6. 19.*) is quite different from

from March 14. which is the 14th Day of  
the first Month in our Almanacks. We say  
the Queen came to the Crown the 8th of  
March, tho' according to the more exact  
account, call'd new Style, it was 11 Days  
sooner, viz. Feb. 25. Yet we speak properly,  
when we go according to our common Com-  
putation. In like manner we speak properly  
when we fix Easter according to the Compu-  
tation, of new and full Moons, always us'd  
as to that Matter, and set down expressly in  
every Book, where the Rule lies.

9. We come to the *Apocryphal* Of the Apo-  
Lessons. We had said formerly, Apocryphal Lessons.  
that it is common for the lesser Lessons.  
and meaner to go under the Name of the  
greater and better part: this was be-  
cause the Calendar, that has in it some *Apo-*  
*crphal Lessons*, bear the general Title of the  
*Order of Holy Scriptures*. This we speak  
by the Bye in 1 Def. p. 72. And now he  
tells us, that this is to allow the *Apocryphal*  
*Lessons* to be styl'd *Holy Scriptures*. Where-  
we meant, that when a Book, or any  
thing else, contains Matter of divers kinds,  
the one large and principal, the other small  
and mean; it is frequent that the meaner or  
smaller part contain'd does lose its Name,  
and the whole Book or Thing containing is  
call'd by the Name of the Principal part con-  
cern'd therein. We have a Book containing  
F 2 a Calendar

a *Calendar* and a *Collection of Prayers*, we call this the *Common-Prayer*. Is it not absurd to say the *Calendar* is a *Prayer*, or goes under the *Name* of a *Prayer*, because the whole Book is so styl'd? *That*, being a *smaller* and *meaner* Part, loseth its *proper Name* in the *general Title*, which is only taken from the *Principal Part*. So here in the *Calendar*-*Title*, the *Apocrypha* loseth its *Name*, the whole being *denominated* from the *greater* and *better Part*, viz. the *Holy Scriptures*. And it is as absurd to prove from thence, that we style the *Apocrypha* the *Holy Scriptures*; as it would be to prove that the *Calendar* is styl'd a *Prayer*, because that is the *Title* of the *Book* that contains it. Here he saith, we talk upon this Head as if our Church were *infallible*, and that we ought rather to own a *Slip*, than to talk after this *loose Rate*. But why doth he not shew us, that the *Rate* that we talk at is so very *loose*; or that we think our Church is *infallible*, because we vindicate what may be vindicated in her? Can't we give a fair Account of her *Injunctions*, but we must presently hold her to be *infallible*?

But he saith, p. 336. He is not far *justling* out any part of the *canonical Scriptures*, to give way for the *Apocryphal*. This we fully answer'd 2 Def. p. 224, 225. and he will

not reply but by Repetitions. And to talk of rather reading the same Books over again, &c. to us, is very strange, who it may be read more of the Canonical Scriptures in one of our Churches in one Year, than he does in *Three* (to speak modestly).

Then comes a very odd Passage in the same p. 336. He saith to me, *If you can't see a Difference between the Churches reading Apocryphal Books, i. e. allowing of the private Reading of them, and appointing them to be read in publick worshipping Assemblies, 'twould be a vain thing for one to argue with you, Not see a Difference, Man!* I saw a plain and manifest Difference between them, and prov'd that the Article (which you subscribe) speaks of the latter, viz. of reading them in the Assemblies; and not of the former, viz. of private reading them; and you scorn to reply to me, or to speak to the Purpose. You are to subscribe to the publick Reading them as well as we, as we have plainly prov'd, and you are not able to disprove; And why do you quarrel with us for doing what you your self have done?

The most plausible Passage is his Quotation from Bp. *Burnet*, who speaking of the Ancient Churches reading the Apocrypha, saith, *Ibar by being usually read, they came to be reckoned amongst Canonical Scriptures.* Where-

upon Mr. Calamy adds, *This I think is a fair Warning.* But before he had intimated any such Danger amongst us, He should fairly have answer'd what we have largely said about this Matter, 2d. Def. p. 230, 231. But that is a Thing upon every Occasion he shews himself utterly negligent in.

Of the Old  
Version of the  
Psalms.

10. The next Head is about the old Version of the Psalms Concerning which, he faithfully speaks to me, p. 338. *If you are contented to declare, that it contains nothing contrary to the Word of God, when you do not know but it may, &c.* He here represents us as contented to declare, &c. when we expressly shew'd that no such thing is or can be required, 2 Def. p. 233, &c. *That of there being nothing contrary to the Word of God respects our Subscription to the Book of Common-Prayer it self, as distinguish'd from the Psalter, and hath no Relation to the Psalter at all:* and yet that Subscription too (as he elsewhere acknowledgeth) respects the Common-Prayer in its Offices and Prescriptions with respect to the Use, or that it may lawfully be us'd. And here he confounds the Subscription and Declaration together; and brings in the Words contain'd in the Subscription as contain'd in the Declaration; and makes the Declaration to contain in it those

Words, that are only contain'd in the Subscription; and then adds, that the Approving it is distinctly express in the Assent and Consent. The Approving of what? The Approving of the Use of it is contain'd in the Declaration: and no other Approving is contain'd in the Subscription or Declaration, but of the Use. And sure, we may use a Translation, where we are not certain that every Word is agreeable to the Original, which is what he means, that we do not know but there may be something in this contrary to the Word of God, or to the Original Hebrew; which is true also of the other Translation. We may unseignedly approve of the Use of a Version, in which we do not know but there may be some Mis-translations, or we must approve of none. Unless he would run up our Approval, to the highest Commendation and the Justification, &c. again, which we think, after so plain a Confession of its being an Hyperbole, he cannot offer to do. We are far from believing that this Version is without faults; the Church owns it has such by law substituting a better Translation in our ordinary Bibles; though she has thought fit to continue this in the Use of the Church, where it may be sung or said according to the Points therein; and we agree that it may be lawfully used.

Of the Dam-  
natory Sen-  
tences.

ii. His Discourse on the Athanasian Creed is wholly defensive in Vindication of his own Subscription to the 8th of the xxxix Articles; and there are two Passages in it very remarkable.

The one is, upon his referring to Mr. Baxter's Explication of that Article, wherein he declares for this Creed, if one part of it may be explain'd, and the *damnatory Sentences excluded*: *faith Mr. Calamy*, p. 338. *As long as his Sense was declar'd* (viz. in Mr. Baxter's Pamphlet) *before his Subscription*, *he sees not, but that he may be satisfy'd*. And p. 339. *So long as the Justices that are empower'd to take our Subscriptions will allow us to give in the Sense, in which we subscribe, before hand, we are safe*. To this we say, that we have grounds to believe that the Body of the Non-conformist Ministers in London, soon after the *Act of Toleration*, did subscribe without giving in any Explication of the Sense; and this after a *Consultation amongst themselves, and mutual Agreement* so to do. Since this, Mr. Calamy does not say, that ever any did before-hand give in such an *Explication* of this Article to the Justices, and that they allowed it. It seems very unlikely that Gentlemen should take upon them to judge of the Sense of Doctrinal Articles

Articles in dubious Points ; or that they should think themselves empower'd to allow the *denying* any, *doctrinal Point*, as this is which the *damnatory Sentences* contain, and which he would have to be *excluded*. The *Subscribers* must satisfie themselves about what is required : it is not the *Justices* Business to give or take their *Sense*. They are to subscribe in the *Sense* of the *Law*, which the *Justices* are to see them do : they are not to be the *Interpreters* of the *Law*, but to execute it.

However, we are certain, no such thing can ordinarily, if ever, be done in the *Countries* : In many Places the *Justices* do but unwillingly receive the Subscriptions of the *Dissenters* ; Some *Chairmen* would rather require more of them than less. So that this Method, if practicable in *London*, would but be to cast *Scuples* into the Minds of his *Brethren* in the *Countries*, who cannot have the *Dispensation*, that he pretends to have. But now, What will he say to us upon this ? Why, p. 339. *Had you, saith he, but given your Sense of Assent and Consent, and the other Terms of Conformity, as you now do, and been admitted in that Sense, I should not think you would have had any Reason to regard the Reflections of any Man.* Why so, Sir ? If this had been done, yet might your *Reflections* have

have hindred our Ministry, and prejudic'd Persons against us, as it actually did, till we fairly vindicated our selves, and brought the Matter to that Evidence, that (blessed be God) it is come to. And you would still have argu'd with us, that what we had done had not been *justifiable* notwithstanding, as you do in the Case of the *Interrogatories in Baptism*, and other Things, in so Solemn a way given in by Dr. Burgess, and accepted as the true Sense and Intention of the Church. But, Good Sir, was not our Sense, of these Things declar'd before our Conformity, by others, as, you say, yours was by Mr. Baxter? and you told us, that the high Men were willing to have it so, to draw us in; though in Contradiction to what you say in another place, that they would fain keep us out. Yet we could not escape your Reflections. How many Ways will you wriggle and turn your self? Are not Fulwood's and Falkner's Books, who have declar'd for our Sense of Assent and Consent and other Terms of Conformity, more publickly taken Notice<sup>of</sup>, than Mr. Baxter's two or three Sheets about the Articles? Does not Mr. Baxter say, he never knew a Conformist but understood the Assent and Consent with the Limitation? How many Bishops could we name him, that openly own our Sense? It were easie to enlarge upon this

SVAN

Digression;

Digression ; but we only add, if we had no Reason to regard his Reflections, then he had no Reason to make them.

There is another Passage very remarkable under this Head. *What is the true Sense* (saith he) p. 339.) *and Intention of the Church of England in the Case*, (viz. about this Article which he is to subscribe) *is with him of small Moment*. Spoken like a *Man of Spirit* ! The *Articles* are *Church Articles* : and the Design of the *Nonconformists* subscribing them, is for the Security of the *Doctrine* of the *Church*, against any erroneous Persons, that might shelter themselves under their Name. The *Church* declares these *Sentences ought to be receiv'd*, and does receive them accordingly ; he subscribes the same, and declares also *they ought to be receiv'd* ; and yet the *Sense and Intention of the Church* is with him of *small Moment*. But saith he, speaking of himself and others, *We regard the Articles only as so many Positions, which the State requires us to own and subscribe, if we expect Liberty to dissent from the publick Constitution, without being molested*. But will this excuse him from subscribing them in the *Sense of the Church* ? Does he not think the State requires them in the *Sense* that the *Church* requires them ? Doth he think the *Sense of the State* is different from the *Sense of*

of the *Church*? And doth not the *State* require Subscription to them, meerly to secure the *Doctrine* of the *Church*? And if the *Sense* of the *Church* then, be the *Sense* of the *State*, then must he make the Subscription in the *Sense* of the *Church*, as well as we, if he deal fairly.

12. As to the *Rubrick* about *Confirmation*, we shew'd him that the *Confirmation*, being *desirous* to be *confirm'd*, and not obtaining it, suppos'd some *Obstructions*, that Men might meet with to binder their actual *Confirmation*: and the *Scruples* about the *Episcopal* way were such an *Obstruction*. This he yeilded to once, and we were agreed upon the Matter, 2 *Def.* p. 244. Now without any new Arguments he renews the Accusation, and overlooks our Interpretation (which before he own'd did answer the *Rubrick*, and suit the way of Expression well enough. Mod. *Nonc.* p. 270. only that he might have something to say under every Head, though in Contradiction to what he had before granted. He intimates that Persons must be *desirous* at least, of *Confirmation* in the *Church* way, else he can't see that the *Church* allows of their being admitted to *Communion*. Now we think it is a fair Distinction that we us'd, between the *Substance*, and *Circumstances* of *Confirmation*. The *Substance* is, the taking upon them, and making

king a publick Profession of their owning the baptismal Covenant before the Congregation, and a partaking of the Publick Prayers for their Confirmation therein. The Circumstances are, the Persons administering, and the particular Rites and Form of the Office. If he be ready and desirous of Confirmation in the Substance of it, this qualifieth him for the Communion. And the Church requireth no more, than what qualifieth for the Communion. The Scruples about the Circumstances of the Administrator, and the Form of Management, can be no Hindrance to that Qualification; and therefore cannot in Reason be suppos'd to be intended by the Church as an Hindrance to the Communion. But 'tis the thing in it self, in the Substance of it, that we must have respect unto.

III. Having done with the several Things reflected upon in the Liturgy, we come now to the Oath of Canonical Obedience, which Mr. Galamy saith, he takes to be the most capital Article of our Debate; nay, in some respects, he saith, he reckons it rather more momentous. And according to his first Representation thereof in his Abridgment, we took it to be so our selves. But as he was pleased in his 2d Thoughts to represent it in his former Book, with those Concessions that he made there to us, and which he here saith, that

be

he stands to, we think that there is very little in it. And we cannot imagin, that his Discourse thereof can do him any Service, unless it be to make some unwary Readers, that only cursorily run over the Book, to think, that surely there must be something in the Matter, or else that such a Man as Mr. Calamy would never spend so many Words about it.

He begins again with the *History of the Oath, and the Popish Canons*, which we have reply'd to, and have plainly shew'd, that even in those Times *subscribing, or swearing to the Canons, or swearing not to do any thing against the Canons*, was quite a different thing from *swearing Obedience, or to be obedient to the Bishop*; that they were two Things of a very different Nature; that where the former was required, it was antecedent to the latter; and that the Obligation to observe the Canons was one thing, and that the Oath to the Bishop was another: And that with us, there is no such thing required as *Swearing to the Canons at all*, but only an Oath to the Bishop. If the Reader will be pleased to peruse his *History of this Matter*, and compare with it our *Reflections* upon it, we can venture him to pass his Judgment in the Case. Nor hath Mr. Calamy said any one thing that hath enervated or destroyed what we have suggested even of doidy bds. w. or fied. w.

led on that Head. And whereas the Oath  
to the Bishop in the popish Times did run in  
an unlimited Manner, it is now by the Re-  
formation limited to *Things lawful and honest*  
only, which makes the Oath also now quite  
a different thing from what it was then.

And we still say, that Mr. Calamy hath  
ixer'd the State of the Question about this  
Oath, from what it was in his first Repre-  
sentation thereof. He asserted before, as he  
now tells us from Mr. Baxter, Letter p. 340.  
That it had reference to the Stated Lands, or  
Canons of the Church, and carry'd in it a plain  
Obligation to comply with them, and submit to  
them in our Stated Practice, where we had not  
a Dispensation. This we say, is swearing to  
the Canons in themselves, antecedently to any  
particular Command of a Bishop enforcing  
the same; and, thos the faith, he is not fond  
of our way of expressing it, yet he will not  
abreaf about it, but let it passe. According  
to their Representation of the Sense of the Oath,  
we are bound by it to the Canons, whether  
the Bishop insists upon what is required in  
the Canons or no. Whereas our Oath is so  
to Bishop, and to this particular Command,  
and that only in *Things lawful and honest*;  
and therefore not to the Canons themselves  
at all, nor not till they become the particular  
Commands of the Bishop, and then we  
must

must consider also whether what is required be *lawful* and *honest* or no. All this now Mr. Calamy grants upon second Thoughts, and gives us his *Concessions*, which he again repeats, p. 345. That the Oath doth not strainly and in the Sight of God, oblige to obey such *Canons*, as upon farther Consideration we do not heartily approve, till we are call'd upon by the Bishop; nor even then such *Canons*, our Obedience to which, tho' it be required of us, we cannot upon strict Search find to be lawful and honest. These we acknowledge are very fair and frank *Concessions*, and we desire no more. We have done, and the Controversie is at an end, if Mr. Calamy would let us alone. These Allowances, he saith, were what he should desire himself, if he were in our Case; and when he was particularly opening his own Sense in the Case, which he had not done before, he was willing to make them for us (and a little for himself too, for he needs them as much as we, with respect only to another Oath that he has taken, but however) we accept of his Frankness therein, and thank him for it. But that which we admire at is, that he cannot see an inconsistency between this Sense which his now faith is his own, and that of Mr. Baxter's, and that he still insists upon it, that Mr. Baxter's Sense is not contrary to his Allowances.

If that was Mr. Baxter's Sense only, and this his own, we grant indeed that he does not contradict himself; but we cannot see, but that he contradicts Mr. Baxter, and his first Representation of the Oath in his 10th Chapter. If he can reconcile them, he may. We desire to deal fairly with him. We have not now to do with Mr. Baxter, whose Judgment in this matter we discours'd of, Second Defence p. 263. but with Mr. Calamy; and though we cannot agree with his Representation from Mr. Baxter, yet we do not see but that Mr. Calamy and we are agreed in this matter. He saith now with some vehemency, Letter p. 352. *Did I ever give it as my Sense, that you were oblig'd to obey all the Canons, whether commanded, or no? I never so much as thought it, nor I believe, Mr. Baxter had either: If I never said it, how do I now contradict my self? What you thought, Sir, we cannot tell; nor what your Sense was, save only by your Writings; but indeed you did write so, and that very plainly in your 10th Chapter, as appears by what we cited from it just now, and as we shew'd, Second Defence p. 253, 275. and all your Readers, that we now know of, understood you so. Indeed we grant Mr. Calamy came off from this in Second Part of Mod. Non. which is the thing we now take notice of. As the matter now stands*

stands between us, granting the Limitation before-mention'd, he has spoken our very Hearts. And whether the *Oath* hath reference to the *Canons already made*, or to the *future Commands* of the *Bishop*, within the *Compan* of the *Canons*, or without ; yet if the *Limitation to things lawful and honest*, doth belong to all the *Obedience that is sworn by the Oath* as he saith, p. 354. he falls in with us ; we have as much as we desire, we are agreed and have done contending in this matter.

There is only one thing more therefore that we shall take notice of ; and that is, to examine the *Distinction* which Mr. *Calam* gives us in this *Business*, and which he saith is a very plain one, and that for want of observing thereof we have made this woful posher Letter p. 345. viz. That we must distinguish between the real obliging force of an *Oath* and the Intention of *Man* to bind us by it. And then he saith, That no *Oath* can oblige us to what we are convinc'd is not lawful and honest ; and that this hath been his Sense as to this *Oath* in particular, ever since he consider'd it, p. 346. And then again he saith, p. 347. He owns our *Oath* cannot in the sight of God oblige us to what we are convinc'd is not lawful and honest. Now if he means no more than this, That this *Oath* cannot be to us *Vinculum iniquitatis*, then is it no more tru-

of this Oath, than of the Jews Oath to kill Paul, or the wickedest Oath in the World ; and it would be true of this Oath, though it were the wickedest Oath that can be made, that we cannot be bound by it to any thing that is wicked ; or that we think so, whilst we think so. For we must not think by our Oath that we can alter the Nature of things, or bind our selves to Disobedience to any just Law. And if we make such a wicked Oath, we are under an Obligation to break it ; and it is our Duty to do so, and not Perjury, which is a Sin. And if this be all his Design, to save us from Perjury, when we break it, we are but little oblig'd to him for this, and thank him for nothing. But we suppose, he must mean, That this Oath being taken only with respect to things *lawful and honest*, the Form of the Oath it self doth not oblige us to any more before God, however Man may intend or interpret it. This we take to be his Sense, because he alloweth the *Limitation* in it only to such things. So that we are not only, *not obliged* by it to any *unlawful* or wicked thing, but by his Allowances, every thing that we think *unlawful*, is precluded out of the Oath it self, which is only to obey in *lawful things*. And then we accept of the former part of the *Distinction*, as home to our Business ; whereby we are sett'r d not only from Perjury in

breaking, but from *Evil* in *making* such a Oath. And this we take to be his Meanin again, because he imputes our taking the Oath, rather to *Imprudence*, than any thin else, p. 346.

But now as to the latter part of his *Distinction*, concerning the *Intention of Man* to bind us by it, we cannot imagine of what use it is, or to what purpose it is brought in, with respect to the *Oath in it self*; though it should be something, with respect to our *Imprudence* in taking it. But what *Intention of Man* doth he mean? We know of no *Intention of Man* in this Case, that ought to be considered by us, but what is the *Intention of the Law*, and is contain'd in the *Form* of the *Oath* it selfe. That we should obey our *Bishop* in all lawful and honest things. This is the *Intention of the Law*, and so ought to be interpreted to be the *Sense* of our *Superiours* in giving the *Oath*; for this is the *Sense* of the *Word*, and all that they will bear, and all that possibly can be contained therein. And we have no other way to judge of the *Intention of Man*, but by the *Intention* and *Sense* of the *Oath*, in the *Form of Words*, in which it is express'd. If he means, that Man may make use of this *Oath* to intrap us by it, by commanding something that he may suppose we shall think unlawful, and so upon our Refu-

may have us at the *Catch* to prosecute and punish us: If this should be supposed, yet this cannot be the *Intention* of the *Law*, or of the *Oath* it self; for the *Oath* is enjoynd alike to all the *Clergy*, according to the fair *Sense*, and is to be made to all the *Bishops* alike, by the *respective Ministers* that are under them; and is not to be interpreted by the *Intention* of this or that *Bishop* in particular, that may possibly have a *catching* or *ensnaring* *Design* for some particular purpose in the *Administration* thereof. Now we are considering only the *Lawfulness* of the *Oath* it self, and whether it may not be admitted by us, as a *lawful Term of Conformity*, which we may comply with: For this it is sufficient, to consider the bare *Form* of the *Oath* in it self, according to the *Limitations*, which Mr. *Calamy* allows; and consequently according to the *Intention of Man*, as far as the *Intention of Man* is the *Intention of the Law*: And thus the *second part* of his *Distinction* is the same with the *first*, and so his *Distinction* is without a *Difference*. We are not here considering the *Abuse* that the *Oath* may be put to; or the *Danger* we may be in of *Prosecution* upon it. This doth not respect the *Lawfulness*, but the *Prudence* of taking it. And we must tell him, that we could not think it *prudent*, when the *Liberty* of our *publick*

Ministry is concern'd, to refuse to submit to an Oath that we take to be lawful in it self; though we might apprehend that it is possible that there might be some *remote Danger* that we might come to be expos'd to, by the *en-snaring Abuse* thereof. But saith Mr. Calamy, *We may unwarily take an Oath, by which we may in general bind our selves to such Measures, as strictly pursu'd, might lead us into that which is neither lawful nor honest.* And pag. 347. he tells me, *I have made such a general Promise, as if it should be kept in all the particular Canons, in which the Bishop has Power to urge it upon me, would draw me into Sin.* But how does a *general Promise* to do things *lawful and honest*, necessarily draw a *Man* in any *Particular* to what is *unlawful and dishonest*? If a *Bishop*, by *Virtue* of my Oath which I have given to him (which is the *general Promise* that Mr. Calamy means) should require or command me to do that, which after the *strictest Search* I cannot apprehend to be *lawful and honest*, then, according to Mr. Calamy's *Concession*, *I am not obliged to it before God*; and how then by my Oath or Promise am I drawn into *Sin*? He tells us indeed, p. 348. we may be liable to be *prosecuted, and cited into the Ecclesiastical Courts, and punished for disobeying any Canon, after being call'd on by the Bishop.* But then

then he presently fetcheth us off himself; And yet I'll own, saith he, before God and your own Conscience, you are not obliged, unless you see the things to be lawful. So that Conscience is safe, which could not be, if we were drawn by our Oath into any Sin. And all this supposed and granted, we cannot for our lives see, but the taking the Oath of Canonical Obedience with us, is a very lawful Term of Conformity; and we are perswaded that Mr. Calamy must in his very Heart think so too, after all these *Concessions* that he hath made.

Well, but he saith, *Letter p. 348.* If we do not comply in things unlawful, we do not indeed violate our Oaths; but he thinks we run the hazard of being charg'd with the Breach of our Oaths by our Superiours, who thought they had us fast and sure: and even this grates upon a tender spirited Man, that he should be charged with breaking an Oath, which he cannot safely keep. And though our Consciences, he saith, may be satisfy'd, we should be apt to think that an unhappy Reflection, and it would grate upon us, if we thereupon quitted our Livings, &c. No doubt of it indeed, it would be thus with me, as well as Mr. Calamy; for I have Sense and Feeling as well he, and it may be, should be as little able to bear Hardship as he or any Man else; for I have not that strength of Spirit or Constitution,

that Mr. Calamy hath. But does any reasonable Man think that this is sufficient Reason against taking an Oath to our Governours, that it is barely possible, that some Persons may ignorantly or maliciously *charge* us with the breaking of it, though we are never so clear in our own Consciences about what we do in pursuance of it? They *charg'd* the ejected Ministers with Breach of their *Allegiance*, with *Sedition*, and even with *Rebellion*, for meeting in separate Congregations for the Worship of God. But Mr. Calamy does not think they were the worse for this *Charge*; or did they refuse thereupon to take the Oaths to the Government? But to answer more particularly, we say,

1. That we have no Reason to think that we shall be ever so *charg'd* by any; much less by our *Governours*, though we should be commanded any thing which we could not comply with. Surely our Bishops understand the *Oath*, and the *Limitations* thereof (having themselves been bound thereby, and still are so to their *Archbishop*) they know what *Allowances* to make for the Sense of those *Limitations*, as well as Mr. Calamy; and are much more inclin'd to make them, than we could suppose him to be. They know, that if they command any thing, which we judge not lawful, that our *Oath* does not bind us to.

to comply therewith ; and therefore they will not charge us with the Breach thereof. But further.

2. If we should fall into such times again, as when *Bisbop White* made that Visitation, concerning which he gives us the Story of *Mr. Rastrick's Troubles* ; and if we should be charg'd by such a Man as *He* for this or any other **Crime** which our Consciences stand clear of ; we should indeed think it hard, as no Suffering is in it self *joyous, but grievous* ; but hope that we should patiently undergo it, and never think the worse of our Duty, because passionate Men might revile us in the performance of it.

And we see not but Mr. *Calamy* is liable to the same **Charge**, having taken his *Oath of Allegiance* to the *Queen*, upon his *Noncompliance* with any of her *Laws* ( if any have but Ignorance or Malice enough to make it ) thought his Conscience be never so clear in what he does.

To prevent the Parallel, as urg'd by us in our *First and Second Defence*. He is very eager to prove the *Canons* not confirm'd by *Act of Parliament*. He saith, he has read 25 Hen. 8. c. 19. and finds not that *Constitutions* made by *Convocations* that have the *King's Assent*, are thereby allowed. This respects the *Actings* of future *Convocations* ; but he cannot deny, nor

nor does in the least go about to disprove, That that *Act* does expressly confirm all the former *Canons*, which are not contrary to the *Statutes*, &c. by a direct Clause therein, which contradicts the Assertion of his former Book, *Mod. Nonc. part 2. p. 229.* and proves that they at least are part of the *Queen's Laws*; That the *Canons* of *Convocations* subsequent to that *Act*, which have the *Royal Assent*, are also confirm'd by the *Act*, he endeavours to disprove: For our parts we are not zealous in the matter, nor does any thing of our *Defence* depend upon it. It was mention'd at first as an Illustration of that, which he has since so amply yielded to us. We will tell him plainly what sticks with us. The *Canons* of 1603. are avouch'd by the *Declaration* annext, to be confirm'd by that *Statute*, they still pass for *Law* in all parts of the Land, multitudes of Proceedings in many *Courts* depend thereupon: And we cannot suppose, that all the *Parliaments* since (even when they were so jealous of the *Canons* of 1640. because a material Circumstance in the manner of signing *them*, was omitted) should suffer this to be, if they did not believe them to have obtain'd the Force of a *Law*.

That the *Oath of Allegiance* is parallel to the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, he still denies,

nies, for this Reason; because he saith, Letter p. 351. *By the one he is only bound to defend and support the Queen's Person, Crown and Dignity, under the Direction of the Laws; whereas by the other, we are bound to the Canons in the minutest matters---- and are liable to the Law if we refuse Obedience, &c.* Now this is trifling; for all *Disobedience to the Laws* is, in the Construction thereof, *against the Peace of our Sovereign Lady the Queen, her Crown and Dignity*, as all *Indictments run*. And her *Mandates* go forth in her proper *Courts* by her *Officers* in *civil Affairs*, as the others do in *Ecclesiastical Affairs*. And he is liable to the Law, if he refuseth Obedience in the minutest matters. Let him try the Parallel in the Instance of *Lent*, which we gave him according to his own Demands, *Second Defence p. 272.* and he will find it exactly so hold: but he wisely passeth it by.

How easily, if we follow his trifling way, might we say, That he must distinguish, in the Oath of Allegiance, between the *real obliging Force of an Oath, and the Intention of Man to bind him by it?* And might add, That if he defend the Queen's Person, Crown and Dignity, according to the Direction of the Laws, he doth not indeed violate his Oath, yet he runs the hazard of being charg'd with the Breach of his Oath by his Superiors. Then could

could we produce the Story of Mr. Rosewell's Trial, and Mr. Baxter's Trial, as he doth the Troubles of Mr. Rastrick, and say; *It grates upon a tender-spirited Man to be charg'd with the Breach of Allegiance, for a Religious Meeting, or a Practical Book; and though he may be satisfy'd, he may be apt to think it an unhappy Reflection, and it would grate upon him to be so charg'd, when he is deprived of his Liberty, and put in hazard of his Life.* This actually was the Case, when the *Lord Chief Justice* said to Mr. Baxter, *Richard, thou art an old Knave, thou hast written Books enough to fill a Cart, every one of them as full of Sedition, I might say, Treason, as an Egg is full of Meat, with more of such Stuff.* Yet Mr. Calamy owns that Mr. Baxter and the other ejected Ministers were as free to take the Oath of Allegiance, as any Men.

Of the Canons of 1603.

In speaking to the *Canons of 1603.* he has left out our long and fair Answer to his former Accusations, and he yet continues them without any Reply. He will mislead the Readers of his Book (unless well established, or well acquainted with his *Ways of Writing*) who read it without comparing it with the Book, that he pretends to reply to. In our *2d. Defence* p. 285, &c. "We distinguished

blueo

"Canons

"Canons that do not belong to us ; and of them  
"that do require something of us. As to the  
"latter, we distinguished between them as  
"in themselves generally set down, and as they  
"may be applied to this or that particular  
"Case in the Administration of the Govern-  
"ment. In this particular Administration,  
"we shewed, That what is incident to all hu-  
"mane Laws, is also to these, *viz.* That they  
"may in some Cases be utterly *unlawful* ; and  
"in other Cases very good and *lawful* : And  
"that it was only in the latter Case that  
"we were obliged to them. We went over  
"the Canons hereupon, that he excepted a-  
"gainst ; and shew'd in what particular Ca-  
"ses they are good and useful ; and in what  
"other Cases and Misapplications they are  
"unlawful. This Discourse lasts for about six  
Leaves together. To all which he makes  
no Reply, but as if he had not understood a  
Word we said ; he saith to me, If I will ex-  
communicate the *Depravers of the Liturgy*, he  
cannot help it ; if I will refuse those that re-  
fuse to kneel at the Lord's Supper, be it to my  
self, &c. with more such Stuff. This is  
strange dealing with us. Doth he not know,  
that Laws are capable of a *Right Application*,  
or of a *Misapplication*, in the Exercise of the  
Government ? And we are only concern'd  
therein, when in that particular Case, in which  
they.

they are applyed to us, they appear lawful and good. But he saith, p. 355. *That many of the Canons are so bad, that he should be very uneasy to take an Oath, by which he should cherish in any Man an Opinion, that it was in his Power to oblige him to Compliance with them.* Now we have examined the worst of the Canons that he could pick out (by which any thing can be required of us) and have shew'd him that there are *none* of them *bad* or *evil* in *some Cases* or *Applications*: and that *all of them* (and all other Humane Laws besides) may be *bad* or *evil* in *other Cases* and in *Misapplications*. And Charity doth oblige us to believe, that neither the Bp. of *London* (whose *Episcopalia* he mentions) nor any other *Bishop*, hath any such *Opinion*, that they can *oblige* any *Man* to any *thing*, but what the Doer thereof must account lawful for him to do. They have no *Pretence* to any *Power*, in the *utmost Stretch* of it, but to require *Obedience* in those *Instances*, in which those under them are *perswaded* of the *Lawfulness* thereof; or to exact the *Penalty* of the *Law* where they are not.

*The last Head is about the Ecclesiastical Courts.* We shew'd at large, how little *Danger* we are in of being *hamper'd* thereby. But if any *Danger* happen to us in the *Performance* of our

our Duty, it is but what All are liable to, and we are never to be the worse thought of on that account. To this he saith, p. 357. *For his part he'll never plead for a Constitution, that exposeth a conscientious Minister to Hardships, for his being conscientious.* It seems plain in other places, he would have no settled *Constitution* or *Establishment*. It is impossible any one should be so contrived by Man, but conscientious Persons may at some time or other be expos'd to Sufferings therein, through their own *Weaknesses*, the *Malice of false Accusers*, or *Male-Administration* of them that are in *Power*. He is ungrateful if he does not upon Occasion commend our *Civil Constitution*, yet may *innocent Persons* sometimes be expos'd to *Hardships* in all the several *Courts of Westminster-Hall*. Yet tho' we bless God that Things are so well as they are, we may and ought to desire a *Reformation* of what is amiss; and may desire an *Alteration* of such Rules or *Laws* in Church or State, as are found to be needless; or that have lost the Use they were intended for; or appear to have brought more *Damage* than *Benefit* to the *Nation*.

And thus having finish'd what we at first design'd in our *Defence*, we should now put an End to the *Reader's Trouble*, but that in looking over Mr. *Calamy's* third Part of *Mod.*

Mod. Nonconf. in answer to Mr. *Hoadly*, to which his *Letter* is adjoyn'd, we find, p. 99. That he has advanced some other Prejudices, by very artful Insinuations, against our Conformity to the National Constitution; which may be apt to produce in unwary Readers a further ill Opinion of our Practice, which we think therefore had need to be remov'd for our further Vindication thereof. This as it lies in that place, is most properly Mr. *Hoadly*'s Province, which we do not intend to take out of his Hand: but as it is an Attack upon all our Practice, we think our selves likewise concern'd therein, in pursuance of the same Design, in which we have been engaged. And we believe we are able to shew that Mr. *Calamy* has no more *Advantages in his Way*, to the End that he intends by these Suggestions, than we have in ours: and that we are as free from all those Prejudices, that he has insinuated, as he: and that the Matter may rather be turn'd upon him; and that we have some *Advantages in our Way*; that he hath not in his.

Of the *Advantages*  
which Mr.  
*Calamy* pre-  
tends to have  
above us in his  
Ministry.

He saith, first, That he fixeth on the sacred Scriptures, as his sufficient Rule and Standard, without admitting any thing, in Doctrine, Worship, or Discipline, which is not there by.

thereby warranted. By which he artfully insinuates, that we do not so; for this is one Thing, in which he pretends his Advantage to lie. This his insinuated Charge we abhor, and we are as clear of as he; and declare that we *admit nothing* in any of these but what we believe to be warranted by Scripture, and that we believe that to be a compleat Rule, that these and all other our Thoughts, Words, and Actions are to be brought to, and judged by. And for the Matters in Question between us, we have shew'd him our Warrant, 2d Def. p. 47, to 53. and in other places.

He faith further, *He allows of no Imposition upon Conscience, nor Force of any sort to constrain it.* We suppose he means, except only by the Word of God. And we declare to him the same, that we allow no other Impositions on Conscience, than those which the Law of God makes; and that nothing short of God's Revealed Will can bind the Conscience of any. We teach no Tradition of Man as a Doctrine from God. We own that our Governours can bind our Practice; but that not immediately, but by Means of the Law of God, which requires us to obey them in lawful Things. But no Mortal can bind our Conscience, or lay an Obligation on them to believe, that any Thing

is

is in it self a Duty that God hath not made so by his Command; or that any thing is in it self a Sin, that God hath not made so by his Prohibition thereof.

He saith moreover, *He is subject to no Authority, which requires punctual Compliance with any thing, which he is not admitted to see the Reason of.* This he pretends another Advantage above us; and yet he is subject to the same Authority that we are, and hath sworn Allegiance to the same Government. And we know not that he is made a Member of the Legislative Body, or a Counsellor of State, or acquainted with all the Reasons of their Actings. But if he would distinguish between the Reasons of the Governors in commanding, and the Reasons of the Subjects in submitting; then we answer, that we are required to comply with nothing, any more than he; that we have not full Liberty to see the Reasons of our submitting to, before we submit. Heradds, *He is allowed to judge for himself, what Mode of Worship is most eligible, and what is agreeable to Scripture, what is lawful, and what is expedient, and what otherwise; and to act with Freedom according to his Sentiments and Apprehensions.* And to insinuate that we do not thus, is, as he tellt Mr. D-son, to say, that we have Horns and Hoofs, i. e. are Beasts and not Men: supposing still, that he doth not speak of the

Act of *Imposing*, which is the *Governours* Act, but of the *Act of Submitting*, which is ours. And so no Christian can act, but as he judgeth it lawful, and expedient, and most eligible, for such Reasons as do occur to him, and all Circumstances considered. And so through God's Grace and Assistance do we, and therefore are as free as he. And he is highly uncharitable, if he thinks otherwise of us. But both he and we are under the same Law of Submission to our *Governours*; and it is because we see Reason to submit to their Determinations in such things as are lawful, that therefore we submit.

He adds, *He is under no Oath or Bond to Superiors, that can hamper him in his carriage towards those that are his Charge. And we have shew'd him at large, that we are bound no otherwise bound by Oath to our Superiors than he is, viz. to obey them in lawful Things; and in which God requires his and our Obedience. And what God requires cannot without Rudeness be called Hampering.* But if he means by *Hampering*, that *Governours may sometimes take Occasion from our Oaths to deal hardly with us, and to expose us to Hardships, he is as liable to be hamper'd by his Oath, as we: there being no fence against unjust prosecutions of Men in Power, that will lie at the Catch.*

He saith then, *He is not liable to be call'd upon to execute any Canons, but such as are truly Apostolical, and contained in Scripture and which therefore are liable to no Exception.* If he means, by truly Apostolical, &c. what is expressly and in Specie contain'd in Scripture, then this which he saith is not true. For he may be call'd on to keep Lent, to subscribe xxxvi Articles, to keep the Door unlock'd when he is Preaching, &c. None of which are Apostolical, or in Specie contained in Scripture. But if he means, that he is not so liable to be call'd upon, or put upon the doing any thing not warranted by Scripture, but that he may refuse it (which is all that is true in the Case) then he hath not any Advantage above us; for we owe Submission to no Mortal, but according to Scripture and the Warrant thereof.

He adds, *He is not forc'd with a great Appearance of Solemity to declare an unfeigned Assent and Consent to what he doth not heartily approve of.* If he insinuates that we do not heartily approve of the Lawfulness of the Use of what we assent and consent to, but that we use what we do not so approve of, it is a most uncharitable Suggestion of Slander. But if he means more by heartily approving, he himself hath been forc'd to own it to be *Flourish and Hyperbole.*

He saith further, *He is not obliged to any thing in the Conduct of his Flock, saving to a few necessary Things agreed upon for common Convenience.* Yet he bath sometimes owned several *Inconveniences* in the way that he is in, and he owns several *Imperfections*, p. 102. And no State can be without them here. See Mr. Baxter at the Funeral of Mr. Corbet, p. 13. But yet *Inconveniences* will not excuse us from *Duties*, and we must do as well as we can with them: But we are liable to them on both Sides, and we shall shew on which side there are *most*, by examining the Particulars, and when we come to set forth our *Advantages*.

He saith, *When Persons come to the Lord's Table, if they are either grossly ignorant or scandalous, he can keep them from it; till they are either better instructed or reformed, without any Danger of Persecution, which all must own a mighty Discouragement.* And it is plainly prov'd in our 2d. Defence, to which nothing need be added, that our Law doth authorize and peremptorily require us to do the same. And so we are as safe by *Law* as he, though neither he nor we may be always free from unjust Persecutions upon one account or other. But we are in no more Danger by the right Application of the Law, than he is of being sent for a *Soldier*.

But He is not tempted, he saith, so profane holy Things, for fear of an Action of Damage for hindring a Man of an Office, for which his receiving the Sacrament is required as a Qualification. This seems at first Blush the same with the former, proceeding upon a not right Understanding the *Law* and the *Case* in this Matter. For a Person's Qualification for an Office depends not on his receiving the Sacrament from the Minister of his Parish; who is therefore no more concern'd in that Statute than any other Minister in the Kingdom. But he must proceed according to those *Statutes*, *Canon*, and *Bricks* that require him to exclude the unqualify'd. But the insituated Charge here is indeed another Thing; he thinks that he hath frighted us, by often repeating this Case of a Man in Office coming to be qualify'd; and now he thinks we may be tempted to do this Wickedness for Fear. And we must own that no Condition is free from *Temptation*, any more than *Inconveniencie*. And we must none of us brag of our selves. But this we say, that a conscientious Conformist is not one Jot more in Danger to be tempted by *Fear*, than a godly Non-conformist is in Danger of being tempted by *Faith*; yea, or *Fear* either, in case a wealthy Contributer offers himself. By the same *Grace* that

that the one escapes the Temptation so doth the other.

But He can administer *Baptism*, he adds, and all the other Ordinances of the Christian Religion, according to the Purity of their Institution, without any needless Additions, without being hard upon the *Scrupulous*, or at all breaking in upon that *Liberty*, to which our Lord hath given all his Subjects a Right. To which we answer, so can we. As to the needless *Additions*, that he would make to intrench upon the *Purity* of the *Ordinance*, we know of none such. As to *Baptism*, which he singles out for an Instance, the Church declares there is nothing belongs to it but *Washing* with Water in the Name of the *Trinity*: Yet in the *Solemnity* of the *Administration*, other Things, in the general commanded by *Christ*, may then as well as at other Times be used, *viz.* *Prayers*, *Thanksgivings*, a *Declaration* of the *Covenant* between *God* and the *Baptized*, a *Confessing* *Christ* before *Men*, and *glorying* in a *cru-cified Saviour*. These are indeed no *Parts* of *Baptism*; but may be fitly joyn'd with the *Administration* thereof, by *Words* or *Actions* apt to signify our *Minds*. Then for excluding the *Scrupulous*, that he supposes to be a breaking in upon the *Liberty* of *Christ's Followers*, it hath been shew'd him that no-

thing in Conformity obligeth to it. However he owns elsewhere, in fact it may so happen in his Congregation (and it may so fall out accidentally in any Congregation) in which Case he only tells us, they may go to another. But what if the other Congregations have the like Determinations, which they scruple, as well as the former? Or what if they refuse him the *orderly Recommendation* to another Church, as the *Eleads of Agreement* require? then there is the same Hardship still. And yet suppose a Man can go to another Congregation, still there is the *breaking in* upon this Man's *Liberty*, and *bearing hard upon the Scrupulous*, in the Congregation that he leaveth, where he could not agree to the Form of Singing, (suppose) to some Officers set up, to the Time of Administration, or other Determinations; which Mr. Calamy grants, every Congregation has Power to make. In such Cases, where the Master of the Determination is lawful, the Exclusion is only *Accidental*, as we shew'd in our former Defence, and may be found in the best managed and most wary Congregation that can be.

But he saith, *He is not forced to a stinted Form, whatever Varieties are required by particular Accidents and Occasions;* And if he prefers

prefers Forms, he is at liberty to use them, provided he and his People agree upon it: and if they do not, he is at liberty to let them alone; which is more agreeable than to be absolutely confin'd, where our Lord hath left a Liberty. If by this he would insinuate, that 'tis an Advantage to be altogether without a standing Form or Liturgy, we must crave leave to differ from him; and shall urge it from Mr. Baxter the other way in its proper place. But if he layeth the Stress upon the being absolutely *confined* to them, whatever Varieties are required by particular Accidents and Occasions. We answer him, That we are not so confined; but that for them other Prayers are allowed, as in all Fasts, Thanksgivings, Wars, Raging Diseases: And other constant Prayers in the Pulpit are also required by Can. 55. and the daily Practice of the Church from the Reformation to this day, is agreeable thereunto. We shall set down this in the Words of Mr. Baxter in answer to D. O. in the last of the *Tracts* that go under the general Name of *Catbolick Communion*, p. 34, 35. D. O. had objected, "That the Exercise of Spiritual Gifts is expressly prohibited in the Prescription of this Liturgical Worship. To which Mr. Baxter saith, It is a Mistake [ marking it the xxxvij Error ] that the Exercise of Spiritual Gifts is

expressly forbidden; unless you bad meant, that just at the Use of the Liturgy, Extemporate Utterance is forbidden; but it is not so in the Pulpit. D. O. proceeds, "The pretence of Mens Liberty to use their Gifts in Prayer before Sermons, and in Preaching, is ridiculous; they are excluded in all the solemn Worship of the Church, To which Mr. Baxter saith; This Answer is not only a Mistake [marking it the xxxvij Error] but of an ill Aspect upon your selves. It's not true, that the Use of Gifts is excluded in all the solemn Worship of the Church; as if Prayer, Praise, Thanksgiving, Explication of the Scripture, Reproof, Exhortation, Comfort, Direction, Benediction, were no part of the solemn Worship of the Church. Indeed some Superconformists have said so, but I bad hoped that you would not. I said, it's of an ill Aspect: For, 1. if Preaching and Pulpit-Prayer before and after, be none of the solemn Worship of the Churches, then all those Churches which seldom use any other (saving a Psalm, which is a Liturgick Form) have no solemn Worship at all. 2. But if it be otherwise (as it is) then the Parish-Churches so far excel most of you, that they have all that you have (Pulpit-Prayer and Sermon, and sometimes a Chapter) and all the Common Prayer more. And is not that better than your Nothing (except at Sacrament?)

ment?) I know that the Nonconformists that I have convers'd with, are in Judgment for more (for reading the Psalms, Chapters, Creed, Lord's Prayer, Decalogue, &c.) But I have come into so few of their Churches that do any more than the common Publick-work (sing a Psalm, Pray and Preach there) that I have in that respect preferred the Churches that do all that, and add all the Liturgy besides, more than you use. Thus far Mr. Baxter in Answer to D. O. or if you please, to Mr. Calamy. And as for the *Liberty* he speaks of, we would only ask him, If his *Congregation* are for a *Form*, and he is against it as less convenient, and yet thinks it lawful, must he not in that Case comply with the Determinations of his *Congregation*? Or if they are against it, and he for it, must not he then let it alone? And yet either of these Ways he loseth his *Liberty*. Or suppose the *major Part* of his *Congregation* are for a *Form*, and the *minor* is against it, must not he then, if he thinks a *Form* lawful, comply with the *major Part*? Now this is our Case; The *major Part* of the Body of the People of *England* have declared for, and enacted a *Form* by their *Representatives*; would it not be very unreasonable now to comply with the *minor Part* against the *major*, when one or other necessarily must be chosen? In this Case there must necef-

necessarily be an Abridgment of Liberty to a Man, unless he will act unreasonably, and contrary to the Form and Nature of Societies.

He then proceeds. *If a Prince dieth on a sudden, and he hath notice of it, he is not oblig'd to wait for particular Directions, to leave out his Name in the publick Prayers, or expect so comical a List of needless Alterations, as is usually in such cases in the Church.* The insinuated Charge is, That we are obliged not to leave out the dead Prince's Name, till we have particular Directions from the Government. This is certainly one of the wildest Charges that ever was brought. Whence should such an Obligation arise? Who ever waited one Minute, after he had certain Notice of the Prince's Death, for Direction to leave out his Name? If he never heard of such a thing, what must the World think of such Insinuations? King *William* died on a Lord's-day Morning; some Churches knew of it in the Morning, and left out his Name; but doth he know of one Church in London that us'd it in the Afternoon? Well, but afterwards there comes out an *Order* of the Government about it; yes, some Weeks after; and for what? To direct the Printers and Correctors of the Liturgy about the Names of the Royal Family, which upon such a Death

Death are to be changed. It does not appear in all things alike plainly to every one how the Change is to be made. When there were two joyn'd together on the Throne, as in the late happy Reign of King *William* and Queen *Mary*, several Words were left out, and others put in, besides the Change of Names; and which were again alter'd when the Throne was filled with a single Person. And there is great need of this sometimes as an *Act* of the Government; for though usually when the *Sovereign* dieth, the Successor is known, yet often the Names of the next *Relations*, that are to be mentioned, are unknown, till the *Order* comes to give Direction in it. We waited for no *Order* to put Queen *Anne* in the room of King *William*, but we did for the putting the *Princess Sophia* in the room of the *Princess Anne* of *Denmark*. Aye, but he saith, This *Order* of the *Queen* and *Privy Council* is a comical *List* of needless Alterations. Pray, Sir, a little more Manners! Who could be thus bold to affront and ridicule the Government, but one who boasts himself in his Freedom from Submission thereunto?

He proceeds again; If there be a *Popish* Prince upon the Throne, he is free from any Obligation to pray, that God would keep and strengthen such a Prince in the true worshipping of

of him, while yet he esteemeth him an Idolater. And if this Prince aims to bring in Popery, and a Foreign Prince, when invited, comes so deliver the Nation from Popery and Slavery; he has nothing to do to make it part of his Prayers, that God would be the Defender and Keeper of this Papish Prince, and give him the Victory over all his Enemies, and so defeat the Design of our Deliverer. As to the first Instance, he cannot but know that we do believe the Papists guilty of Idolatry and false Worship, in the Worship of Images, and of the Host, and in praying to Saints and Angels, &c. and that this is the Doctrine of our Church, and is so maintain'd to be by our greatest Divines. And therefore, he ought in all Reason to think, that it cannot be intended by these Offices, that we should pray for their being preserved in their Idolatries. But he knoweth that we believe also, that a great part of their Worship, (as to the Matter of it,) is true Worship, viz. of one God in Three Persons, and through Jesus Christ, &c. And 'tis express only with respect to the true worshipping of God, that a Papist may be kept, and strengthened therein. And when we pray for this, we do at the same time desire, that he may be delivered from the false worshipping of him, and much more from the Worship of Creatures instead of him, which is the quite con-

contrary to his insinuation. As to his second instance, we did not believe the Prince of Orange, any more than the Princess that went over to him, to be King James's Enemy. But those that advis'd him against, and hindered him from calling a Parliament, and that put him upon such Measures as were contrary to the English Constitution; these were his Enemies, as well as the Nations. And these we could heartily pray against, that were for subverting our Religion, invading our Properties, and bringing in a dispensing Despotic Power contrary to Law, that that Prince might have been delivered from them. And we could at the same time rejoice in hopes of our Deliverance in such a Way, when there was no other left to preserve our just Rights, which are not at the Will of any Prince whatsoever, but are settled by National Compact. Such is our Constitution, and our Prayers ought never to be intended, or understood in an Inconsistency with it.

But then he adds moreover, That if a spurious Prince be abegged upon the Nation, he is not bound solemnly to give God Thanks according to a Form prescribed. But we must tell him, it is not our Part or Province to judge of the Legitimacy of Princes; but are to refer that to the States of the Kingdom. But if the Government appoint a Thanksgiving

giving to be kept, he is as fully bound to obey it, as we. But as to the Form in such Case prescribed, it is no part of our Liturgy; and if there be any thing unlawful to be used therein, we are no ways bound to use it neither. And as to all in this and the foregoing Article, the Law hath now secur'd both him and us from Danger.

He saith, He is not bound to hope against Hope in the Case of the Deceased, nor doth he send those to Heaven at the Grave, whom he condemns in the Pulpit. Nor yet are we. But though we declare in the Pulpit the Condemnation of all them that die impenitently, yet we do not pretend to judge that this of that Person in particular did die without Repentance, unless there be apparent Ground for it; for *Charity hopes all things*. And if we declare our Hopes of the Repentance of such as have express their Sorrow and Remorse for their Sins in their Sicknes, doth this contradict our Declaration in the Pulpit against the Impenitent? What have we to do to judge the Hearts of Men contrary to their own express Profession? But if there be no ground for such a charitable Judgment of a wicked Man's Repentance, and so no Hope of him, then are we not bound to use the Office, or those Expressions of Hope therein? This we have sufficiently proved, to which we need add no more.

He goeth on, That he can cast out a Brother, that is notoriously scandalous, in pursuance of the Gospel-Rule, without any other Steps than are therein mentioned; conversing with him first alone, then with two or three, and at last bringing the Matter before the Church, without any Concern with the Civilians, who make a Gain of Ungodliness, and get their Livelihood very much by the Sins of the People. But he hath not Power to administer an Oath for Confirmation to the Witnesses, to prove the Fact against which he would proceed, as the Scripture requires should be done to put an end to a Controversie in Judgment. And what Church doth he mean here that he is to bring the Matter before? Will he confine this to a particular Congregation? Will he allow of no Appeal? Or will he put this Power into the Hands of a single Minister only? If he had explain'd his Meaning, it had been more easie to have known what to have said to him. He might have seen this Matter set in a better Light in our *First Defence* p. 110, to 116. As for what he saith of the Civilians, meaning their Courts, it is mere Rillery; and is as applicable to any other Court of Justice, and the *Lawyers* therein, where they who are concern'd in the convicting and punishing evil Doers, have their Salaries and Fees.

But we find, it is no new thing with Mr. Calamy to reflect on Governments.

He saith next, *He is not obliged to confine his Charity to a Party.* And he might as well have said, He is not obliged to murder, steal, or commit Adultery. Who is oblig'd to confine his Charity to a Party? What Charge he would insinuate by this pretended Advantage, we cannot imagine. For our Parts we extend our Charity even to him. We know no such rigid Notion, that we are bound to receive, That none can be good Men but those that are of our own Way. There must be Abatements made for involuntary Errors and Mistakes in Men: and a great many Circumstances are to be considered, that may lay a just Foundation for the Exercise of our Charity to those that differ from us, while they fear God and work Righteousness.

He saith, *He can keep private Days of Humiliation upon any Emergency publick or private.* And if it be for Exercise of Devotion we in the Establishment can do so as well as he. But if he does it for the Ends in which the Canon forbids it, viz. the excommunicating Persons possessed, or for seditious Purposes, the Government will take hold of him and that justly.

In short, he saith, *He can do whatever Christ hath made his Duty, as a Minister, without having his Conscience hamper'd by any ensnaring Bond.* *He can deliver the whole Will of God, secure the Purity of all divine Institutions, and use the Liberty his Great Master hath left him in Things indifferent without Confinement.* And so may we in the Ministry of the Church of England do whatever Christ hath commanded us; let him prove the contrary if he can. Mr. Baxter declares, *Append. to his Life, p. 78.* That Ministers of the Church of England have by the Law of the Land all Power belonging to Pastors. And again, *In many Parishes of England, there is all that is essential to true Pastors and Churches: We can declare the whole Will of God, so far as we know it; For what should hinder us? Nay, we are bound to it in a solemn Manner at our Ordination: And what a strange Insinuation is here, as if we could not? And we do also enjoy the Purity of all Divine Institutions; It is not enough for him to deny it, or to imply a Charge against us without Proof. And we use the Liberty that Christ has left us: But we believe, that a Liberty from the Commands of Magistrates in lawful Things, as hath been before stated, is none of that Liberty which our Great Master hath left either him or us.*

Thus we have gone over the *Advantages* that he pretends he has in his Ministry above us; and have remov'd the *Prejudices*, that he hath advanc'd against our Ministry for the supposed Want of them. What he adds further, p. 101. concerns the *People*, not *us* in our *Ministry*, and so we pass it. And yet what he saith as to *them*, may by an easie Application receive Satisfaction, from what we have replied to his pretended *Advantages* over *us*. And this is all that he hath to say in his glorying over us; and what a meer Nothing it is, we dare appeal to the Judgment of every indifferent Person.

But we shall go further with him, and shew him that we of the Establish'd Church have some *Advantages* in our Way and in our Ministry, which he hath not.

*First*, We exercise our Ministry as *Members* of a *National Church*, which is no small Privilege to them that believe with Mr Baxter, That it was our Lord's Design that such *National Churches* should be erected. This he often proves, particularly, *Appendix* to his *Life*, p. 70. at large, and p. 78. He saith, he will prove against all *Deniers*, That the *Church of England*, as it is a *Christian Kingdom*, containing confederate *Churches*, under a *Christian King* and *Laws*, is that very *Form* that *Christ offer'd to settle in Judæa*.

and did settle by Constantine. Without mentioning his Reasons, we shall only add the Testimony of Mr. Stoddon, *Pastors Charge*, p. 89. who mentioning a *National Church*, adds, of which that eminent Servant of Christ, Mr. Baxter, hath given so rational and scriptural an Account; and which, that I know, is not by any one, as yet, answer'd.

Then we exercise our Ministry under an *Episcopacy*, or Superiority of governing *Bishops*, which *Superior Rank*, Mr. Baxter saith, *Christ settled in his Church*, *Discourse of Knowledge and Love*, Ep. Ded. which cannot be refuted, as he hints, without Danger of charging *Christ* with seeming *Mutability*, as settling a *Form of Ministry and Government*, which he would have to continue but one *Age*. This Advantage we shew'd at large from Mr. Baxter, 1<sup>st</sup> Def. p. 60, 61. and shall now add the Testimony of that other Aged Non-conformist, Mr. Stoddon, in the before-cited *Pastor's Charge*, preach'd before an Assembly of Ministers in *Exon*, A. 1694. who having spoken of the *Church Congregational or Parochial*, comes next to that, which is *Presbyterian or Diocesan*, which, p. 125. he saith, alone is that which in *Scripture* is call'd a *Church*, that is, a perfect and adult *Church*, that hath *Power* by its *Officers*, to propagate and constitute other *Churches* and *Congregations*,

ons, and to over-rule all the particular Pastors and Congregations that are within its Bounds. Then speaking of the Part Ruling, and Part Ruled therein, he saith, p. 126. *This Company of Ruling Presbyters must have one Head or President, which is the Episcopus Episcoporum, or else it were a Monster, an Heap of Confusion, and unorganiz'd Matter. This Head must be One, else there can be no Union or Consistency of the Parts, nor Attainment of its Ends. This one Head must be fixt and constant, and that in the same Person, till there be just Cause to change; else the Government cannot be steddy, but is dissolved and broken, and consequently the Church, with all its particular Congregations, most dangerously expos'd. And this is that Government which is called Aristocracy, and may as properly be called a mixt or limited Monarchy; which I take to be the most agreeable to the Pattern given us in the Mount of the Holy Scriptures.* — And is so far from intrenching upon the Right, or infringing the Liberty or Government of the Church Congregational, that it is the best Defence to it. Thus far that Aged Nonconformist.

Further, Our entring into our Office, and our ministering in the particular Churches, to which we belong, hath the Advantage above that of our Brethren in several Particulars, which Mr. Baxter reckons up, in

the above cited Append. p. 74. wherein he saith, the Churches that differ from us swerve from the Rule; intomuch that he adventures to say, that to join with such as fixed covenanted Members will be a State of Sin. We shall mention some, as First, he saith, that Scripture fixed Ministers or Elders were all ordained by superior general Pastors, either alone, or with their Presbyters: And so are we. This is an Advantage, as it renders our Ministry more currant, and indisputable, and acceptable amongst the Generality of the People of England. There is no Controversie about our Ministry, which we receive by such an Episcopal Ordination, except it be amongst a very few. Mr. Baxter goes on, Scripture-particular Churches were all distinguish'd by the Limits of their Habitations or Proximity, So are ours. And he adds, that there never were two Churches in the same City or Bounds, save Hereticks, or of Men of divers Tongues, at least where one could hold them all. And then, that no lawful Church in Scripture was gather'd out of a true Gospel-Church. Which is our Privilege, that ours are not. And p. 79. He saith, The confederate Parish-Churches of England, that have able godly Pastors, want nothing, which Christ or his Apostles, or the universal Church of Christ for 600 Years, yea, or to this Day, did ever make or

judge necessary to the being of Ministers or Church. Nor have the said Churches any Error or Sin, in Doctrine, Worship, or Government; which either Christ or his Apostles, or the universal Church of Christ for 600 Years after Christ, did judge inconsistent with the being of a valid Minister, and true visible Churches. We are not chargeable with gathering Churches out of such Churches as these. He saith moreover, that Scripture Churches never divided the Christians of the same Family, some to one Church, and some to another. Neither do we. And as he concludes, Our Churches are compaginate and confederate, so as the Members of one Body should be, and as Scripture Churches were, and as Christ would have had the Jewish National Church to be. Thus far Mr. Baxter, as to the particular Churches in which we minister, in all which we have the *Advantage* above our Brethren,

Moreover we have a mighty *Advantage* by the Certainty and Concord of our Church Worship, in Comparison of those that Mr. Baxter observes, *Ibid.* p. 75. Have little more than such Preaching and Praying, which cannot be known for true or false, sound or unsound, till the Words are past. And so, adds he, all God's Worship must be continually uncertain to the Flocks, and of as many different Strains,

as the Preachers differ in Parts and Wisdom: and it must be low, and poor, and confused, where-ever the Ministers are young, raw, erroneous, or ignorant. Mr. Baxter hath shewn in divers Particulars, *Christ. Direct.* par. 3. Qu. 78. and the Thing is plain in it self, that both *Forms* of Prayer, and *Free-praying* without a stinted Form, have both their Commodities and Discommodities: And then he concludes with giving his own Judgment. *I crave leave to profess*, saith he, *that my own Judgment is, that somewhat of both Ways join'd together, will best obviate the In-commodities of both.* Now we have both Ways with us, which our Brethren have not; and therein we have the Advantage. And thereby our Worship also comes to be more currently acceptable. Most of our People are for a stinted Form, and some are for free Prayer: and so we have that, which may be most desirable by those of both sorts. We need not insist here upon the Advantages of Free-Prayer, which our Brethren now do only chuse. But this may be said, that with a great Number of People, a Form hath the Advantage above it. Mr. Baxter observes amongst other things, that in a Form, the *Auditors* know before-hand whether that which they are to join in, be sound or unsound, having Time to try it; and they can more readily

dily put in their Consent to what is spoken, and make the Prayers their own---it being hard for the duller sort of Hearers, to concur with an Understanding and Consent as quick as the Speakers Words are: not but that this may be done, but not without great Difficulcy in the duller sort. So that though Worship may be laudably managed by *some* Persons, and for the Profit of *some*, without a Form; yet it could not be so generally or nationally, either by the weaker sort of Ministers, or for the Use of Multitudes of Hearers. In *conceived Prayer*, the Hearer must first exercise his Understanding to conceive the Meaning of the Words spoken (and if there be Obscurity in them, or Dulness of Apprehension in him, the whole is stopp'd at first) And there must be withal an Act of his Judgment to try the Words, whether apt and fit to be joined with. And then the Affections are to follow. And all these must be at every Petition in a conceived Prayer, without Stop or Pause. All which it is not easie for the duller sort to exert with so much Quicknes. Whereas in a Form the previous Acts are over for the main, and the Words are understood and try'd before; and the Supplicant hath nothing more to do, but to excite and join his Affections, and lift up his Heart agreeably to the Words. So that

to many Persons here is a nearer way to the Exercise of gracious Affections, without any Stop or Remove, than there is in the other. Here must indeed be the Exercise of the Understanding and Judgment too; but this is quickly performed by Reason of the continual Use of the same Words, which the Mind is before-hand acquainted with. This is a great Advantage to *such Persons*; for though Persons well instructed may understand Words at first Hearing, and be able to go along with them; yet this cannot be easily done by others, who must have the same Words often repeated, in order to a more clear and distinct Apprehension of what they pray for.

We may observe further in our Church-Worship some other *Advantages*, both for the attaining of a more clear Knowledge of the plain and necessary Things of Religion; and also for the exciting and exercise of gracious Affections. The clearer Knowledge of the Things of Religion is promoted by that which we mentioned before, viz. by the continual Use of the same Words and Forms; by which the Idea's of holy things are more easily convey'd to the Mind; as also by the constant Use of the *Holy Scriptures*, which are read in our Churches, four Chapters every Lord's Day, and eight or more Psalms

Psalms or Hymns, besides other Portions thereof: And by the constant Use of the *Creed*, and the *Ten Commandments*, which are the Ground of the Catechism; by which these great Things come to be more riveted in the Memories, and clearly conceived, than they can be supposed to be, where they are seldom or never repeated: And by picking out and reading such Portions of Scripture at particular Times which do most fully declare the most fundamental Doctrines of our Religion, *viz.* on one Part of the Year about the *Birth* of Christ, at another about his *Death*, then of his *Resurrection* and of his *Ascension*, and of the Mission and Operations of the *Holy Spirit*; at which Times also these Doctrines are wont to be insisted on in the Pulpit; without which People might attend many Years, and hear many good Sermons on particular Texts of Scripture, and not be particularly taught these Fundamental Doctrines, unless they have the Advantage of a Catechistical private Education. And for the exciting and exercise of gracious *Affections*, and the keeping the Spirit awake, the Peoples bearing a Part in our Form (which is so excepted against by some) hath a considerable Tendency. We shall set down this in Mr. Baxter's Words, *Cbr. Direct. Tom. 3. p. 146.* *The primitive*

primitive Christians, saith he, were so full of the Zeal and Love of Christ, that they would have taken it for an Injury, and a quenching of the Spirit, to have been wholly restrain'd from bearing their Part in the Praises of the Church. The Use of the Tongue keeps awake the Mind, and stirs up God's Graces in his Servants. It was the Decay of Zeal in the People that first shut out Responses. While they kept up the ancient Zeal, they were inclin'd to take their Part vocally in the Worship. And this was seconded by the Pride and Usurpation of some Priests thereupon, who thought the People of God too profane, to speak in the Assemblies, or meddle too much with holy Things. What an Advantage to the Exercise of Love and Devotion is there in the affectionate Hymns of Praise, so distinctly reciting the Benefits of Redemption, &c; and in the frequent Use of the Doxology, Glory be to the Father, &c. By which the Praises that are directed to one God in the Psalms and Hymns, are distinctly attributed in Gospel Times to the three glorious Persons, whom we adore. What an Advantage for the Exercise of Repentance is there in reciting the Commandments (by which is the Knowledge of Sin) with a particular Application to our selves, in a Petition for Mercy and Grace after every one of them? What an Advantage must it be to

to the Exercise of *Faith*, solemnly by Word and Action to declare our Believing in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, in the Recital of the several *Creeds*? And whereas Faith, in the *Attributes* of God, and *Mediation* of Christ, is to be our great Work both in Prayer and Praise, What Advantage must it be, to have the frequent Mention of his several *Attributes*, and his Son's *Merits*, as is done in the Liturgy, in comparison of having the same only once mention'd in the beginning and ending of one long continued Prayer?

It is another *Advantage*, which we think we may insist upon, that we minister before God, in a Way most free from *Superstition*, or Danger thereof; not only from positive *Superstition*, but negative also: as Mr. Baxter rightly distinguisheth, *Care of Ch. Divis.* p. 282. The one is when we say, That God *hath commanded* what he hath not; the other is, when we say, That God *hath forbidden* what he hath not. The one fathers upon God falsely what he hath not ordained, the other fears where no Fear is. Both of them are, as he adds, a *belying of God*, an *adding to his Word*, and the great *dividing Engine* of the Church. There is much *Superstition* in *not doing*, as well as in *doing*. See *Burges's Answer re-join'd Pres.* p. 64. So that, if a Man abstains from *nothing*, out of Conscience to God's

Pro-

Prohibition, which he hath not prohibited, he is equally guilty of Superstition with him that doth a thing out of Conscience to God's Command, which he hath not commanded. And we must needs say, we should think we should be guilty of it, and of *adding to the Word*, if we should pretend that Scripture had given particular Rules about Gestures, Habits, professed Signs, &c. where they are only general; or if we should think or pretend that we come nearer the Pattern of Scripture for using one sort of Gestures, Habits and Signs, than for using others, that are equally warranted by the General Rules thereof. And we think we should be further to blame, should we at the same time neglect, or make void the Commandments of God in other matters. The Scripture saith, *Honour thy Father and Mother*, (meaning all our lawful Governors) and *whoever curseth or revileth them of their Authority*, shall be guilty: We dare not lay then, *it is Corban*, or pretend Exemptions in such and such Cases, where we do not find that the Scripture hath exempted us. They that come nearest to the Scripture Pattern, have undoubtedly the Advantage on their side: But whether it be *Any one* on the one side, who *rejects* the Determination of sundry Circumstances left undetermined by Christ, about Gestures, Habits, and professed Signs, (which

( which others use ) under pretence that they are not particularly found in Scripture, tho' agreeable to the general Rules thereof; or we on the other side, who obey the Christian Magistrates in lawful things, which the Scripture doth so vehemently urge, ( while the other denies their Power or Authority therein ) let every Christian judge.

It is also another great Advantage and Happiness to us, that our Ministrations of Holy Things, is *in a Church*, which God hath mightily own'd, and to which he hath eminently vouchsafed his gracious Spirit and Presence; which hath been the Bulwark of the Protestant Religion, and preserved even by Miracles of Deliverances. The ancient *Nonconforming Puritans* never thought it a Glory to separate from, but a matter of very great Lamentation when they could not minister in it. And to separate from a Church because of the Impositions of lawful things we should fear, would be in Appearance to separate from the Catholick Church, or from all the Churches upon Earth; seeing there is no Church upon Earth without some such. To separate upon the account of an imposed Liturgy, or significant Ceremonies, &c. is too like a Separation from the whole Body of Christ, as Mr. Baxter speaks concerning some Persons, in the before-cited *Append. p. 13*

With whom would these Men hold Communion, if they had liv'd in any Age till 200 Years ago? When, as far as ever I can find, there was not one Congregation of Christians or Heretics in all the World, that was against Forms of Worship, or Bishops, or all Ceremonies. Let them name one if they can.

And we have this great *Advantage* in our Ministry yet further, that we promote a *Reformation* in the most laudable Way, in a Way that is most apt to produce the same; and to which the Way of Separation in its own Nature, we fear, is contrary. For whatever *Accidental Effect* it may be supposed to have towards it, it is apt *in its own Nature* to exasperate and heighten our Differences, and to prejudice others against what they that separate, do desire. Whereas to comply with the Christian Magistrate in things that we judge lawful, tends to bring Men to a Temper, and to incline them to do what we reasonably desire, towards a nearer Approach to Perfection in the Church, or towards a Cont desction to our Brethren, who differ from us. And they who are perfwaded, that the Reasons why some stiff Men oppose the Alterations which are desir'd, are purely taken from the Exasperations they receive from some in the Separation; will always judge, That the *Advantage* as to pressing forward in

wards a further Reformation, lies on our side. It is the moderate part of the *Church of Eng-  
Land*, that have shew'd more hearty Concern  
for, and more endeavour'd after Union and  
Reformation these seventeen Years past, than  
any other considerable Number of Men have  
done, or are capable of doing in the way that  
they go on in.

And we have not only an *Advantage* in  
these things to that desired End, above what  
our *Brethren* now have, but also above what  
our *Fathers* had; our Lot being cast in a  
time when the Churches are fill'd with such  
excellent *Bishops*, eminent for Piety, Mode-  
ration, and Zeal for God. When the *Old  
Puritans* wrote earnestly against Separation  
there were many things with which they  
were justly aggrieved, from which we are  
freed. They desired and *waited* for Al-  
terations, when there was no humane likeli-  
hood of any such thing. Whereas now there  
is a great Disposition in the Church to en-  
courage Moderation. It is true, the Work  
met with Stops in 1689. And he saith right,  
we *dare not* affirm what we quoted from the  
*Historian*; but we verily believe (by Con-  
verse with Men of the same Temper with  
those that seem'd most opposite to Abate-  
ments in the then *Lower House of Convocation*)  
that the Miscarriage came not from their  
*Fondness*.

fondness for these things, that we desire to have alter'd: but, as they pretend, because they know not what will suffice; when they see so many unaccountable Charges muster'd up, like this of Mr. Calamy, That "Conformity requires us to pray for our Princes, that God would grant them in Health and Wealth long to live, when we know that they are dead and buried, till an Order of Council comes forth to relieve us. And when we strive to pacifie these Gentlemen, by telling them, That these Charges are like Chancery Bills, in which many unaccountable things are suggested and heap'd together, and some few things only are meant and insisted upon; then they remain still stumbled about the Denial of the Doctrine about indifferent Things, and Obedience to Governors, as we shew'd from Dr. Sh--- Second Defence p. 85. Yet notwithstanding these Difficulties, the Interest of Moderation is growing (blessed be God) and increasing in the Church, we hope, daily. The Governors of the Church being such as our Fathers did long to see in those Dignities. In some measure we have what they waited for, and are encouraged in the way of our Duty to wait on.

And we must needs say after all, That we cannot but heartily wish, that our Governors would not continue to insist upon

the Use of, or exert their Power in several of these things: But that for the promoting of the publick Peace, and because of the different Apprehensions that many pious and good Men have thereof, they might be conceded to them. The Prejudices of Education, and different Studies that Men have been engaged in, we all know, are often a very heavy Weight even upon Good and Learned Men. And supposing that these things might be retained still without any Inconvenience, if they were not so contested among us, and there were no Occasion taken therefrom for Heat and Animosity: yet seeing it is otherwise, one would think that external, indifferent Modes and Signs that might well be spar'd, without any Detriment to the Religion, Worship, Discipline or Government established among us, should not be of that Value as to deserve to be retained, in these distracting Circumstances, which we are now in by Occasion thereof. Religion is never advanced by being embodied in Externals; it then only becomes a *Shibboleth* and Distinction, which those only have a Zeal for, that have least of the vital Flame of true Love to God or Man; which is the true Spirit of Christianity, and which wise and good Men only value.

**A N S W E R**  
**TO**  
**Mr. Calamy's INDEX.**

WE added to our *Second Defence* an *Index* touching Mr. Calamy's manner of handling this *Controversie*, in hopes that our *Dissenting Brethren*, upon the summary View of Mr. Calamy's Writings therein, would disown so strange an Undertaking; and we do not despair of attaining our End. In return, he is pleased to *Answer* our *Index* by another. Concerning which, we observe in the general, that we should think the fairer Way had been, *first*, to have answer'd our *Charge* before he had recriminated and made another. For if we had been guilty of never so many Absurdities in our way of Writing, that would not have made his peculiar manner of handling this *Controversie*,

verse, ever the more justifiable. *Recrimination* is but a poor way of arguing at any time, and of no use, while the former *Charge* stands unanswer'd. We further observe, that he makes an *Index* to our Books, and not to his own, and thinks it the better way. Whereas we, in directing the Reader to our own Book, did point to the *Pages* where the things were prov'd, which we alledg'd; whereas he does not direct us to any place, where the things are pretended to be prov'd, which he alledgeth against us, save in one or two places only, which we shall shew him are nothing to the purpose.

We shall go over his *Index* in all the **XX** Articles thereof.

I. He saith; *I make Tragical Complaints with very little Reason*; and quotes *Epist. Ned.* p. 2. *1 Def.* p. 84. let these be compar'd with our *2d Def.* *Preface* p. 10. and *2d Def.* p. 2, to 8. And we leave the Reader to judge what Reason we had for Complaints. He adds, *I pass lightly by such things as I had abundant Reason to complain of, and instances in the Abuses of Godfathers, Misapplication of sundry Canons, ill Management of the Ecclesiastical Courts.* And yet in the places to which he refers his Reader, we declare against the *Abuses, Misapplications, and ill Management*; and this so plainly, that when it is for his

turn,

turn, he unjustly reflects upon us, as speaking against the Canons themselves, reflecting Discredit on the Church, &c, Mod, Nonc. p. 288, 337, 353. and many other Places; and How then, do we lightly pass them by?

II. He saith, *I discover a Dislike of the Impositions, and yet stiffly endeavour to uphold them.* *Impositions* are an ambiguous Term, and are taken, either 1. for the Matter or *Things impos'd.* 2. For the *imposing them*, in such and such Circumstances, and under such and such Penalties. As to the latter of these, we have declar'd that we had no *Hand or Heart in the making or continuing sundry Impositions.* But as to the Matter or *Things imposed* we do indeed vindicate the Lawfulness of them in several of the Instances that he has set down; and, Where is the Inconsistency in this Matter? It is the *submitting to them that we defend*, as being *Things in themselves lawful*, and which may lawfully be submitted to by us, and not the *imposing them in such Circumstances, &c.* And yet some of his Instances are far from being rightly worded. As, that *I vindicate the promiscuous Use of the Office of Burial.* If he means it as to the Persons, that he shews it is not suited to, we disclaim the Use of it as to them, and declare against it. That *I vindicate certain Canons there enum-*

rated. Whereas we distinguish of the *right Application* of them, in such particular Instances, in which they may be lawfully observed; and of the *Wrong Application* of them in other Instances in which we have nothing to do with them, 2d Def. p. 287, to 296. We stand to what he reckons an *Inconsistency*, and which we are sure is none, *viz.* so long for *Alterations and Concessions*, and yet to defend the *Lawfulness* of the *Things impos'd*. Our Reasons are set down, 1 Def. Ep. Ded. p. 5. 2 Def. Pref. p. ult. And we affirm that *his Way*, and not *ours*, is the direct Method to obstruct the Reformation, and by passionate Aggravations to hinder the Union and Amendments in order to it: as we have shewn, 2d Def. p. 76, 84. Whilst he talks so much against Impositions, he imposeth Things upon us, which are directly against our Sentiments, and which we have declar'd against.

III. His next Charge consists of several Particulars, which he calls *Special Arts in me, that deserve particular Notice.*

1. That *I laid aside the Consideration of Rec-ordination*, 1 Def. p. 8. and yet treated of it largely, in the Postscript. I laid it aside as not belonging to our Defence; and when that Defence was near printed, I was perswaded to add that Postscript for the Sake of

my dissenting Brethren. And I hope it will not be without good Fruit. What a wonderful Special Art was this?

2. That I turn the dreadful Judgment of cutting off impenitent Sinners by Death into a great Mercy. This is too horrid a Charge to have so light a Name given to it, as my Special Art. I said, it is a Mercy in general to the World, that Souls are judg'd by a merciful Saviour; that it is comparatively a Mercy to Sinners, to be hindred from going on in those Sins that would increase their Damnation. I add, it is a Mercy to the Survivors when many Sinners are cut off, who are a Plague to the World; so David saith, *of thy Mercy cut off mine Enemies.* But I am as far from thinking it in it self a Mercy for impenitent Sinners to be put past Hope and Help, as he can be. However the Reader must observe, that this Answer was always wav'd as insufficient for our Defence; and another at large insisted upon in two distinct Books, to which now he has not thought fit to make any new Reply.

3. That the same thing is acting according to Law in me, which in others is call'd acting according to their Fancies. For this he quotes our 2d Def. p. 23. which proves the

whole world had very bad reasons quite

quite contrary, and his Charge is wholly groundless, and without proof.

4. That I run down the Sense of the ejected Ministers about Assent and Consent, and other Things, and yet say, I have nothing to do with them. This he has also in several Parts of his Letter, and p. 316. he challengeth us thus, Defend your selves as long as you please, provided you let us alone. We reply,

1st. That it does not appear that the Ejected Ministers in any Body or considerable Number of them, did ever give this to be the Sense of Conformity which he has given. It is true, he quotes 5 or 6 of them, as to some Particulars, who were never empower'd by the Rest to give their Sense; and chiefly he quotes one of them, who has declar'd against this Use or Abuse of his Writings, which Mr. Calamy has put upon them, as we have shew'd in Def. p. 118. and more largely 2d Def. p. 264, 265. It is true, all the Ejected Ministers were dissatisfy'd with the Terms of Conformity; but the Dissatisfaction of many of them might be on other Grounds, in which our Defence is not concern'd. As they might scruple the Renouncing the Covenant, as fearing to involve themselves and others in the Guilt of Perjury. They might be afraid of Scandal, in building again what they had thrown down; and

and submitting to what they thought had been well taken away; and which they before had declar'd against. They might scruple *Re-ordination*, as fearing they might thereby null. their former Misistrations. These and such like things might be the Reasons of their Dissatisfaction; and 'tis ver-  
y plain that they were so to many. And how then do we run down the *Sense* of the *Ejected Ministers*? We had Reason to say, we do not concern our selves with them; no not so much as to enquire whether those five or six, whom he refers to in his 10th Chapter, be rightly quoted or no: or whether any others, or how many were, or were not of their Mind: and thus we declar'd, 2d Def. p. 91. But,

2dly, if it could be suppos'd that he had given us the *Sense* of the *Ejected Ministers*, i. e. of the Body of them: yet what a Jeit is it to bid us, *Defend our selves, but not meddle with their Sense*? If any think our Practice in any Matter to be unsawful, Can we defend the Lawfulness of it, without shewing, that they were mistaken, that thought it unsawful? Our *Congregational Brethren* say, that *Occasional Conformity*, and that Branch of it, which is most contended about, viz. *Kneeling at the Lord's-Supper*, is a symbolizing with the Idolatry of the Church

of Rome, an Encouragement of Imposers, a Hindrance of Reformation, &c. Now if Mr. Calamy vindicates the Occasional Conformity, and shews that these Aggravations thereof are unjust, Does he assault the Congregational Bretbren, or any ways injure them? Yea, May he not defend his Practice of Occasional Conformity, against those unjust Imputations, and yet have nothing to do with the Independents in the Matter? Is not Self-Defence a Duty that every Christian is bound to in proper Seasons? Had we accus'd the ejected Ministers of Sedition, Faction, &c, he might well have said, *Defend your selves, but let them alone.* But to say so to us, who had largely commended them for their excellent Gifts and Graces; and excus'd the Prejudices on which the Mistakes of some of them (who oppos'd the Terms of Conformity which we have defended) were grounded; we judge to be highly unreasonable.

IV. He saith, *I charge him with Mistakes, when all the Mistake is evidently on my own Side.* Of this he pretends to give three Instances. The one, that *I say it is a Mistake that a Minister is oblig'd to baptize all Comers*, and quotes *I Def. p. 26.* which he saith is contrary to the *Canon.* Whereas in that *Page 26.* I refer'd him to the proper place of that Matter, viz. *p. 192.* where what

what I said is made good; and more largely in our Discourse of the Canons, 2d Def. p. 287, &c. The other is about mistaking Dr. Morley, which Mr. Calamy one would think should have ventur'd to say, as we have shewn in this 3d Defence in its proper place, as we have also the next Instance, viz. his Mistake about the Oath of Canonical Obedience. On which Side the Mistake lies, let the Reader judge.

V. He saith, *That I am guilty of what I accuse my Neighbour.* He instances in,

1. *My taking things upon trust without examining them.* For Proof he mentions, the *Lords Journal*, Mr. Humphrey's *Book*, the *Bishop of London's Episcopalia*. Whereas we took all these to be truly and exactly quoted, as he had quoted them, and gave our Answers accordingly: and knew not of the least Need that we had to examine or consult any one of them. Indeed we mistook one Circumstance in the *Lords Journal*, by his ambiguously wording of it, which we have now largely accounted for in this our third Defence.

2. *My using divers Weights and Measures.* He instances in our accusing him of rendering them odious, whereas we inveigh against the ejected Ministers Sense. This we have at large

I draw his motto in vain his  
nois Jim

large answer'd under the *Third Article* of this *Index*, and in our applying the *Passages* out of Mr. Baxter's *Cure of Church Divisions* to him, and rejecting them out of Mr. *Hoadly* as apply'd to us. And we affirm, that we had and have just Reason both for the one, and for the other. *Judicet Lector.*

3. *My charging him with using personal Reflections, &c. and forgetting what Language I use.* Now here lies the Difference between his References and ours. He quotes our Books, where these Reflections are found; but refers to no Proof, where they may be shew'd to be unjust. Whereas in our Charge on him, we shew him the Instances wherein his personal Reflections are unjust, and refer him to the Places where we have prov'd them so.

VI. *That I wrest the Scriptures in Favour of Notions, that they were never design'd to support.* His Instances are, 1. The *Regeneration of all baptized Infants*; which is only his ambiguous and ill-worded Expression. Whereas in our 1. *Def.* p. 28, 29. and 2d. *Def.* p. 135. The Scriptures are so plainly and particularly urged, that in either of his Books he has not shew'd that we have us'd or apply'd them to any other Sense, than what is evidently the Mind of the Holy Ghost therein. 2. *That that may be asserted to be always true which is only true sometimes.* That *all* and *always* is often us'd with Limitation

mitiations, is very plain. But we own'd, that what we wrote, 1 Def. p. 71. about this Matter, was not home to our purpose. It is the only Matter of Substance, that we were mistaken in, and therefore recalled 2d Def. p. 213. where we rectify'd the Mistake, and made the Answer right, to which he can return no Reply, and now he disingenuously chargeth us with the Defect that we had before acknowledged and made up.

VII. That *I prevaricate, to avoid the Force of his Arguments that pinched me.* To prevaricate in Law is, when a Man seems falsely and deceitfully to undertake a Thing with an Intention and Design to destroy it. But what false or deceitful Measures have we taken? Or what cunning Arts have we used? What Tricks of *Legerdemain* can he accuse us of? We undertook the *Defence of Conformity*, and we have pursu'd it fairly and plainly, and we believe, too strenuously for Mr. Calamy to push it by. And if we had indeed *prevaricated* in it, I doubt, he would have lik'd it never the worse. Yes, but he faith, *I do it in order to the evading the Force of his Argument that pincheth us.* No Sir, we turn it by, without any *Prevarication* in the Case; we argue openly in the Matter; and we defend only what we think is Truth, and that in these very Instances with re-

spect to which this is charg'd upon us, viz.

1. In pleading our *Liberty to use private Baptism when Godfathers are scrupled*; whereas, saith he, the Words, if the *Child live*, are equivalent to the Supposition of *Sickness*, and by Consequence, that that *Office* must be us'd only in *Danger of Death*. Whereas we have largely shew'd the contrary in our 2d *Def.* p. 166, &c. and confirm'd it in this 3d *Def.* and if we have prov'd the *Liberty*, we may plead it.

2. In our *being mov'd with Indignation for his quoting of the 36th Canon in the manner mention'd*, 1 *Def.* p. 48. whereas the Ground of our Reflection was not because two Things refer'd to in that *Canon* are not in the *same Page*, but because what he alledged in the *several Pages* of that *Canon* are not *ad idem*, they refer not to the same, but different Matters, as we there shew'd, and more largely explain'd 2d *Def.* p. 175. and now have again confirm'd in this 3d *Defence*.

3. In our *speaking of going out of Town when prest with the Office of Burial*. Whereas we there prov'd that we lay under no Obligation to use the *Office* in the Cases there spoken of; and that to avoid Noise, we could easily withdraw our selves, when any such Cases happened. And where now is our *Prevarication* in this, to avoid fairly what we are not obliged to.

VIII. That I trifled in calling him to Repentance. *I. Def.* p. 44, 84. there he mentions a wrong Cause or Ground of this Call. But as to the Ground on which I did it, I did not trifled, but was very serious, and so I am in the renewing of it.

IX. That I fasten heavy Imputations on innocent Persons. His only Instance is, *I. Def.* p. 45. where we charge the confounding common Signs with Sacraments, as the Ground of Ignorance in some, and Socinianism in others. We stand to the Charge. There are two sorts of Signs. 1. Signs of God's Acts, wherein he offers, tenders, or exhibits Grace to Men. 2. Signs of our Acts, whereby we signify our own Minds or Duties, by Words or Actions. The first sort of Signs are never to be used by us, but when the Lord appoints them. The other are lawful for us to chuse and use, and we have abundant Warrant from the Scriptures so to do. The confounding these is the very Root of the Socinian Doctrine about the Sacraments; and, the not distinguishing them is the Ground of the Ignorance of many about the Nature and Number of Sacraments, what they are, and why they are Two, and no more.

X. He saith, I can differ from the common Sense of the Church, and yet be in the right. He instances in receiving to the Sacraments

those that scruple Godfathers and Kneeling, What we say on those Heads, must be seen in our Books, not in his *Representation* of it in an *Index*. We have fairly argued the matter, let him confute our Sense, if he can. Is not this a pretty Fancy, to put a part of the Controversie it self into an *Index of Peculiarities*? As to what we have written on these *exclusive Terms*, we lay, That if by the *Church* he means the *Persons* of the present *Churchmen*, neither he nor we can tell, whether we differ from the *common Sense*: we are not able to poll them. But if by the *Sense of the Church*, he means the *Orders* of the present *Establishment*, we have shew'd how agreeable our Sentiments are therewith. And he must not think, that his Assertion in this *Index* of their contrariety therewith will pass for Proof against us.

XI. He saith; *I set down Histories and Authorities that prove, 1. what he never denied, and he instances in several of them.* We are glad to find he *allows* them: Whether we did not urge them to good purpose, let the Reader judge. 2. *That prove the contrary to what I produce them for.* He mentions Bishop Moreley's Case in our *Second Defence* p. 188. and this is one of the places that he offers a Reference to his own Book about, viz. his Letter p. 330. And we desire the Reader to judge

of it. *We are not obliged to*

of his way of writing by his own instance. Is there any one Word to prove, that what we produc'd, proves the contrary to what we produc'd it for? Not a tittle. He does indeed endeavour to confront the Testimony we produc'd with other Arguments, particularly with another Passage in Bishop Morley's Book, which we have reply'd to in this Third Defence. But the Passage we produc'd was home to our purpose, and nothing therein is pretended to turn against us.

XII. That I groundlessly insinuate, i.e. what I dare not assert. His only instance is, That the Presbyterians hindered the Comprehension in 1689. The place he refers to, is a Quotation from an Historian, Second Defence p. 29. and now he saith, We dare not assert it. He knows well, we dare not, and why we dare not. We do not envy him his Privilege, that he dare throw all manner of Dirt upon the Established Church. We can answer well without daring to make Returns; we have no mind to aggravate, but our Design is to heal and compose. 2. What I never go about to prove, viz. That Conformity is the same in all Points, except the Declaration of Assent and Consent, as it was in the Days of the conforming Puritans, save only wherein it is granted to be altered for the better. This indeed we did assert, and little expected to have a

Denial insinuated : But he saith, *We did not prove it.* Why, truly it would have been too long and needless to have done it, to have gone over all the Parts of Conformity in their time and ours, and shew'd their Agreement (and then he might have said indeed, That we set down Authorities that he never denied.) But if indeed he doubted of this Matter, why did he not instance in some of the Terms of Conformity now, that were not in the days of the old Puritans (except only as we excepted) for our parts we know of none.

XIII. He saith, That I confidently affirm things contrary to plain Evidence. His Instances are, 1. That I say, 2d Def. p. 44, 45. Mr. Humphreys is for us. We affirm it, so far forth, as his first Book is for us; which indeed was the very Ground of our Postscript for Re-ordination; and so far forth, as his second Book does own two things (as Mr. Calamy himself quotes him, for we need look no further) 1. That what he wrote in his first Book was a Truth. 2. That there was a grand Necessity upon him at that time to defend it. This was all we affirm'd about him, and this, we say, is for us: And if this be contrary to plain Evidence, then Mr. Calamy has misrepresented him, for we take the Evidence from him. Again, 2. That I say Mr. Calamy is gone off from the Principles of the

old Nonconformists, &c. 2 Def. p. 68. But I did not say, He was gone off in *every* thing, but in those things of which I was there discoursing, and of which I made full Proof, and let him clear himself, if he can.

XIV. He saith, *That I falsly repeat his Words, and deliver his Sense*; because I represent it as his Sense, *That 'tis unlawful for Persons to submit to things lawful, meerly because Superiours require them, to maintain their Christian Liberty*. Now it is evident from divers things in Mr. Calamy's *Introduction*, and from the Tenour of a great part of it, that 'tis the *Imposition* it self, that he strikes at, and supposeth to be sinful meerly as an *Imposition*, and not only in respect of Circumstances (upon which account, it is confess, in other places he likewise opposeth it) and because of the *Sinfulness* of the *Imposition*, as an *Assuming* too much, and an *Encroachment* upon our Liberty. He thereupon impugns and disputes against the *Submission* to such an *Imposition* and *Encroachment* in our *stated Compliance* therewith, as giving Encouragement thereunto. This I take to be equivalent to the holding it unlawful for Persons to submit to things lawful in themselves in their *stated Compliance*, meerly because they are required by Superiours only to maintain their *Christian Liberty* in indifferent things.

But if Mr. Calamy doth disown this Sense, I have no more to say to it.

XV. That I carelessly oppose the very Church which I pretend to defend; because I declare, if she adds new Ceremonies, as she must determine whether they are fit to be impos'd, so I must determine whether they are fit to be submitted to. And is this to oppose the Church? Alas, how little does he understand the Church, that he does professedly oppose! She requires all her Members to examine by the Word all her Determinations, by declaring, that *any particular Church may err, &c.* Aye, but he saith, We have own'd her Power. Yes, how? Why, that she has *Power* to determine Circumstances which are *not contrary to the Word of God*, viz. in Matter, Manner, or End, or any other way. And every one must determine for himself whether the things he submits to, are warranted thereby. We do not oppose the Churches *Power* in any thing that is *warrantable* by the Word; but if any thing be enjoyned that is *contrary to the Word*, we do, and must oppose the Churches *Power* in that, and we are no more obliged than he, thereby.

XVI. He saith, I urge a way of Reasoning that falls on, and hits my self. The only Instance is, That the Zeal of the *Lords* for an *Explanatory Clause* (about the *Use* of the *Con-*

Common-Prayer, is, he saith, a *strong Argument* against us, That that is not the *Sense* of the *Declaration* without that *Explanation*: We answer, No such matter: Their *Zeal* for such an *Explanation* was only a *strong Argument* of the moderate and *kind Inclination* of those *Lords* to bring in the *Nonconformists*, or many of them, by that *Clause*; though they might not think it any otherwise needful. This we have set in a full light in this *Third Defence*. This is accidentally now a part of the *Controversie* between us, and should in all reason be manag'd by *Argument*, and not by putting it in an *Index*.

XVII. He saith, *I wittingly neglect the Explication of his Sense, with relation to the Affair of Mr. Humphreys, in a friendly Message. I declare I know nothing of the friendly Message, nor what Explication he means.*

XVIII. He saith, *I quibble with Words ambiguously us'd, as about Circumstances and Ceremonies; 2d Def. p. 46, 47, 48. I appeal to every understanding Reader, let the Places be consulted.*

XIX. He saith, *I strangely pride my self in suffering, if there should be occasion in the way I take, from rigorous Imposers, without considering whether or no God calls me to it, 2d Def. p. 303, 304. Hero we cannot make*

the Readers Judges between us, as under the other Heads. For the Charge only relates to two things, which can be known only by the Searcher of Hearts. 1. That I pride my self in Sufferings. 2. That I do not consider whether or no God calls me to Sufferings. We have nothing to do but to appeal a Judice *non competente*, from this censorious Usurper of God's Prerogative. He saith, lastly, *quodam* XX. That *I am inconsistent with my self*. By owning the *Impositions* prove Occasions of Division, and yet representing them as expedient for Order and Decency, and to prevent *Factions and Divisions*; 2d Defn. p. 45. with p. 61. But there is no *Inconsistency*, as these things lie in our Book. For the latter place speaks of *Determinations in general*, where the Times and Circumstances are duly attended to, in which Case they may be of use to that End. But the former speaks of the *present Times and Circumstances*, in which we judge there should be an Abatement of the *Imposition* of some things, which are less suitable to attain the Ends of such *Determinations*, than others might be; though still being lawful, they may oblige the Subject to *Compliance*. He proceeds, That *I make a Distinction without a Difference, between the Principles of the ejected Ministers, and his Representation, which he*

he would have to be the same. But his giving the Words of five or six of them, does not prove the Principles of the Body of them. And if it did, I might distinguish between them, as to my *Consideration* of the one and the others; and I might omit the *Consideration* of the one, while I treated on the other, which is what is meant, 2d Def. p. 90. *aberr.*

On the contrary, he faith, That *I will not allow a Distinction where there is a Difference*; as between the *Lower House of Convocation*, and me and my Neighbours: And again, *Between those that have had the Ascendant in the Church, and such Men as I.* Now the Reader must know, that this Difference, so far as this Debate is concerned, therein, is about excluding the scrupulous from the Sacraments. And we largu'd upon it, 2d Def. p. 24, to 29. and leave it to the Reader, only adding, 1. as to the late *Representation* of the *Lower House of Convocation*, which he supposeth as different from us as East from West; we have shew'd the contrary [that it does not at all oppose us] in its proper place in this *Third Defence*. 2. As to those that have the *Ascendant in the Church*; He must mean, either, 1. in *Dignity and Government*, viz. the *Bishops*; and then he has not brought one *Bishop* to oppose our Sense. For as to *Bishop Morley*, we have prov'd what he saith of him

to be all mistakes. Or else, 2. in Number, viz. That they that are of Dr. F. of Whit-  
church's Judgment, are more than we. We  
answer, we cannot come to the Point. We  
do allow there is, and hath been a Difference  
amongst Men in their Apprehensions about  
these things. And the most that can be  
made of his *History of High and Low Church*,  
in the beginning of his former Book, is only  
this, That there have been always some in  
the Government, that have been very stiff  
and zealous in pressing the Impositions. But  
it is also very plain, that there have been great  
Men in the Church, that have not had the  
same Sentiments in some things, which Mr.  
Calamy pretends to be only right. In the *main*  
*Matters* wherein our *Defence* is concern'd,  
we find not but both sides in the *Church* are  
generally agreed. As we have shew'd him a-  
bout our Sense of *Assent* and *Consent*, and he  
owns that in forty years space there has not  
been one Book from the hottest Churchman  
that declar'd against it. Dr. Burges's Sense  
of these things was presented by the Bishop  
of Winchester, and own'd by the *Archbishop*  
to be the *true Sense and Intention of the*  
*Church of England*. The same might be shewn  
other ways. The Difference between the one  
and the other, seems to lie in this. There are  
some that have a higher Opinion of the  
Use

Usefulness and Expediency of some things impos'd, which we only plead for the Lawfulness of; and as a Consequence of this, they may be apt to commend and extol those things too much, perhaps sometimes with such *Flourishes* and *Figures* as Mr. Calamy owns he has us'd in speaking against them. They also were for imposing these things with *Penalties*, that we are not call'd to own; and as a Consequence of this, they have exprest themselves too rigidly about *Exclusive Terms* and other Matters, on purpose, as Mr. Baxter thought, to exasperate the Nonconformists; to be sure with less Care to satisfy the Scruples, and prevent the Objections of the Nonconformists, than they have us'd, who so earnestly desire the Re-union of all good Men to the Church. And we are no more obliged to take the Sense of Conformity from those that Mr. Calamy speaks so much of, as having the Ascendant, than from others. Nor for all Mr. Calamy's haste, are they more of the Church, or more for it, or for its true Interest. Yea, and for Numbers, we shall conclude with Mr. Baxter's Words, which we quoted in our Second Defence, out of the Append. to his Life in Folio p. 78. where he gives a true Account of the Church of England from the Articles, Apology, Homilies, Liturgy, Ordination, Canons; and faith, ~~and last a new sort of Bishops~~

Bishops rose up---- these call'd themselves the Church of England, when there were but about four or five Bishops left alive, who, Dr. Hammond said, were of his Mind. Some such domineered afterwards, but never prevailed, neither to retract the Churches Books and Laws, nor to get the major Part of the Clergy to own them. Now the main Question is, Which of these two Parties shall be call'd the Church of England? Neither of them alone: they are two disagreeing Parts of it. I argu'd against the last, professing not to do it against the first. We quoted this before, for the sake of the last Clause, to shew, that Mr. Baxter never intended that his Words and Writings should be produc'd against those that Mr. Calamy opposeth. He professeth he did not argue against that Part of the Church of England, that stood to the Articles, Apology, Homilies, Liturgy, Ordination, Canons; but against a domineering Party, as he calls them [the same that Mr. Calamy perhaps means by them that have the Ascendant] that elsewhere are said, to have a part to act, to exasperate the Nonconformists; for so the rigid over-doing and straining things did then, though it may gratify Mr. Calamy now. These Mr. Baxter meant, and not the other Part of the Church of England, as he professeth. But we have something more to observe from

from this Quotation now; that according to Mr. Baxter, 1. We have the Sense of the Church, in the Articles, Liturgy, Canons, &c. and that the high domineering Men (as he calls them) that had the Ascendant, could never prevail to retract the Churches Books and Laws, which are on our side. 2. That we are the Major Part, and they could never (as he adds) get the Major Part of the Clergy to own them. It seems though they had the Ascendancy in Dignity at some times, that were more hot and dangerous; yet even then they had it not in Number; and we hope that the Numbers of them that were for straining things to an undue Height, on purpose to exasperate the Nonconformists, are now greatly diminished; for if that was their Design, they may see by Mr. Calamy's Writings, that it is now quite spoil'd. Mr. Calamy in his Preface to his last Book, p. 5. tells us, That he had been better pleased, if the confuting of his Representation had been managed by the open Enemies than the avowed Friends of Moderation. And we easily believe that he speaks his very Heart. The hot Carriage of some Men did exasperate, and occasion the Dissention of many at first, as it did of Mr. Rastrick at last; But now (when the Nonconformists have a Law to secure them in the Exercise of their Ministry in the tolerated Churches) all their high No-

Notions do but gratifie Mr. Calamy, ( and if there be any more of his Mind ) and highly please him. To have a Memorialist represent the Church in Danger by Moderation, and to have such as plead for it charg'd ( as Mr. Calamy expresseth it ) with designing to undermine the Church: This justly displeased the Ejected Ministers once, as it does the Nation now. But this is what Mr. Calamy would have: And he is as ready to give them the Name of *The Church*, or being for the Church, and understanding the true Principles of the Church, as they can best attribute these Titles to themselves. There is nothing ( to use his own Expressions ) so disconcerning to him in the whole Affair, as that he has not been attack'd by these Men only. Then had these angry Men on both sides widen'd the Difference more, instead of composing it, and by their Exasperations the Argument would have been soon lost in the Scuffle, and we should never have had the Debate brought to an Issue, which now we are in some hope may be done.

**BOOKS Printed for R. Buttrough at  
the Sun and Moon in Cornhill.**

**M**anuductio ad Letitionem Scripturæ Sacrae, Augusti Her-  
manni Franckij, S. Th. Prof. Hallens. Omnibus Theo-  
logiæ Sacrae Cultoribus commendata, à Petro Alz, S. T.  
P. cuin nova Præfatione, de Impedimentis Studii Theologici, &  
Appendice, exhibente latitudine Ecclesiæ Anglicanae Scriptorum  
Loca, ad Illustrationem Oppositi facientia.

*Pietas Hallensis: Being an Historical Relation of the wonderful Foot-steps of Divine Providence in Erecting, Carrying on, and Building the Orphan-House, and other charitable Institutions, at Glauchau near Hall in Saxonie, without any visible Fund to support it.* By *Augustus Hermannus Princez*, Professor of Divinity in the Friderician University of Hall, Pastor of Glauchau, and Director of the Pious Foundations there. *Continued to the beginning of the Year MDCCHI.* In a Letter to a Friend. And an Appendix giving a more clear and full View of the Progress of Learning and Christian Piety, both in the said University, and in the Royal Collegiate Schools, under the Protection and Patronage of the present King of Prussia. To which are added several considerable Papers relating to this Work.

The Harmony of the Holy Gospels digested into one History, according to the Order of Time; divided into Three Hundred and Fifteen Lessons; with suitable Medications and Prayers subjoined to each Lesson. Done originally by the Author of the Devotions by way of Offices, Published by Dr. Hicks. Reformed and improved by *James Bennell Esq;* late Ac-  
comptant-General of *Ireland*, for his own Use. And now pub-  
lished from his own Papers, for the Use of others. By the Au-  
thor of his Life.

The Superintendency of Divine Providence: Being a Sermon preach'd before the Lord Mayor, &c. on the 29th of May, 1705. By Francis Fox, M. A.

The History of Infant-Baptism, in Two Parts. The First being an Impartial Collection of all such Passages in the Writers of the Four first Centuries as do make for, or Against it. The Second, containing several Things that do Help to illustrate the said History. By *William Wall, Vicar of Shoreham in Kent.*

An Introduction to the History of the Kingdoms and States  
of *Asia, Africa and America*, both Ancient and Modern, ac-  
cording to the Method of *Samuel Purchas*, Chancellor of  
State to the King of Sweden.

The following is a list of Officers. By the A-  
Commander-in-Chief of the Army, for the use of officers. A-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. B-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. C-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. D-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. E-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. F-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. G-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. H-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. I-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. J-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. K-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. L-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. M-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. N-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. O-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. P-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. Q-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. R-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. S-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. T-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. U-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. V-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. W-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. X-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. Y-  
Adjutant-General of the Army, for the use of officers. Z-

A N  
INDEX

. To this

## THIRD DEFENCE,

With some Reference to the former.

(The first Figure notes the Pages of this  
3d Defence, the 2d of the other: In  
which the things are clear'd which are set  
down under the several Heads following;  
viz.)

**I.** **T**HE Concessions and Allowances  
made by Mr. Calamy in some of  
the most principal Matters of  
our Debate.

1. *That the Church hath Power to decree  
and determine some external Circumstances in  
the Worship of God;* p. 6. with 2d Def. p. 47,  
164.

2. *That the Magistrate may oblige his Sub-  
jects to attend on the Worship of God, in the way  
against which they do not pretend matter of Con-  
science;* p. 18. with 2d Def. p. 71. M 3. *That*

3. That the Charge of his Xth Chapter, That the Assent and Consent did mean, the highest Justification of every Point and Syllable, &c. was Hyperbolical, p. 30. with 2d Def. p. 115.
4. That a Sacramental Regeneration is imply'd in the Phrases us'd in the Office of Baptism, and that those Phrases are not blameable, p. 42. with 2d Def. p. 132.
5. That Godfathers are very desirable, so far as they are Sureties to the Church for the Education of Children, and that he doth not doubt, but thousands have been brought up to a good understanding and sense of Religion, by the sole Care of Godfathers and Godmothers.— 2d Def. p. 156, 157.
6. That he will not censure those that use the Sign of the Cross, nor say, it is unlawful so to do, p. 57. with 2d Def. p. 179.
7. That kneeling at the Lord's Supper is lawful; and that his Argument, brought against it, is strain'd, if us'd to prove it unlawful, — 2d Def. p. 156. lacking from 3rd
8. That it is lawful to subscribe to the Use of the Apocryphal Lessons, so far as the VIth Article sets it forth, p. 69. with 2d Def. p. 226.
9. That he doth not contend about the Use of the old Version of the Psalms, or the truth of the Proposition objected against it in his Xth Chapter, — 2d Def. p. 232. lacking from 3rd
10. That the Athanasian Creed is an excellent

# The INDEX. 161

Explication of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and that it is lawful to subscribe to it, in the Words of the VIIIth Article, p. 72. with 2d Def. p. 237.

11. That our Explication of the Rubrick about Confirmation suits it well enough, and answers the Rubrick, p. 76. with 2d Def. p. 244.

12. That the Oath of Canonical Obedience doth not oblige us to obey the Canons that we dislike, till they become the Commands of our Bishop; nor then neither, if upon search they do not appear to us to be lawful and honest, p. 80. with 2d Def. p. 254.

All these twelve Things he grants and allows,

II. Such matters of the Debate which we had largely insisted on and prov'd, and which Mr. Calamy, in this his last Undertaking, doth wholly pass by.

1. Our whole Proof of the lawfulness of Re-ordination in some Cases, p. 2. with 2d Def. p. 30.

2. Our whole Proof of the lawfulness of the Use of Rites, Ceremonies and significant Actions in the Worship of God, from Scripture-warrant, and Reason, and the allowed Practice of all the Churches, p. 5. with 2d Def. p. 49.

3. Our whole Proof of our sense of the Declaration of Assent and Consent, from the end of the Law, and the manner of wording the Declaration it self, p. 33. with 2d Def. p. 124.

4. Our whole Proof that the Scriptures use the same and like Phrases, as are found in the

Office of Baptism, with respect to all that are visible Church-members, and that the same are pertinently us'd, p. 44. with 2d Def. p. 135. 1st Def. p. 29.

5. Our whole Proof that we are not bound to use the Office of Burial, at the Graves of those that die impenitent in gross Sins, p. 65. with 2d Def. p. 204.

6. Our whole Proof that the Rule to find out Easter is a good Rule, p. 66. with 2d Def. p. 215.

7. Our whole Proof of the lawfulness of using the damnatory Sentences in the Athanasian Creed, p. 72. with 2d Def. p. 240.

All these seven Things he passeth by.

III. Such Charges which we had formerly answer'd; and which Mr. Calamy renews and repeats, without taking notice of our Answer, or pretending to reply therunto.

1. That to use the Passages, objected against in the Office of Baptism, may ensnare People, and tempt them to rest in the outward Ordinances, p. 44. with 2d Def. p. 137.

2. That we are not allowed to Baptize any Children privately, but in case of Sickness and danger of Death, p. 55. with 2d Def. p. 166.

3. Concerning the exciting signification of the sign of the Cross, as spoken of by Hooker and Comber, p. 58. with 2d Def. p. 184.

4. Concerning the Canon's explaining the Liturgy in case of those that scruple kneeling at the

*the Lord's Supper*, p. 62. with 2d Def. p. 191.

5. *Concerning the Canon requiring the Burial of all not Excommunicate, &c.* p. 65. with 2d Def. p. 208.

6. *Concerning justling out the Holy Scriptures, and the matter of Scandal, in the using the Apocryphal Lessons*, p. 68, 70. with 2d Def. p. 224, 229.

7. *Concerning Submission to sundry of the Canons of 1603. which he objects against*, p. 93; with 2d Def. p. 285-- 297.

In these seven Things, he continues his Charge, but doth not reply to the plain Answers made thereunto.

IV. Such Matters of this Debate, which though formerly insisted on by us, are here more fully treated on, as Mr. Calamy hath given occasion.

1. *His Insinuation that all determination of Circumstances in Worship, ought to be made by particular Congregations*; Answer'd, p. 8. with 2d Def. p. 66.

2. *His Objection that our Submission doth encourage Imposers*; Answer'd, p. 18. with 2d Def. p. 82.

3. *That the Lords and Commons, by dropping a Clause they debated about, did declare that more ought to be meant, by the Declaration of Assent and Consent, than to the Use*; Answer'd, p. 34. with 2d Def. p. 105.

4. *That*

4. That Godfathers with us exclude the Parents Right, more than Godfathers in the reform'd Churches abroad ; Answer'd, p. 45. with 2d Def. p. 141.

5. That he is hard put to it to conceive, how the Sign of Christ's Merits can be used, without securing and conveying them ; Answer'd, p. 57. with 2d Def. p. 175.

6. His Quarrel about the Title given to the Calendar ; Answer'd, p. 67. with 2d Def. p. 220.

7. His mistake about the manner of approving the old Version of the Psalms ; Answer'd, p. 70. with 2d Def. p. 233.

8. His Observation, that though we do not violate our Oaths, yet we may be charged by others with doing so ; Answer'd, p. 87. with 2d Def. p. 261, 305.

These eight Particulars were answer'd before ; but he hath given us occasion to speak to them again, to make every thing more plain.

V. Such things as are new Objections, in Mr. Calamy's last Undertaking, against any part of our Defence, and are here Answered by us.

1. That the old Puritans were content to use what they did not unfeignedly approve of ; Answered, p. 27.

2. His Reply to our Argument from private Baptism, that Godfathers are not intended for the Use he imagines ; Answer'd, p. 47. 3. His

# The INDEX. 169

3. His Assertion that the Responses made by Godfathers in the Name of the Children, are much the same with those made by the Marcionites for the Dead; Answer'd, p. 49.

4. That the Representation, made by the late lower House of Convocation, doth oppose the Use of private Baptism, where the Rituall are scrupled; Answer'd, p. 55.

5. That Bishop Morley is against us in the matter of the Liturgy's excluding them that do not kneel; Answer'd, p. 61.

6. His Distinction between the force of an Oath, and the Intention of Men to bind us thereby; Answer'd, p. 82.

7. His Fear that we may cherish in Men an Opinion, that they have Power to oblige us to what is Evil; Answer'd, p. 94.

8. That he would not plead for a Constitution, that exposeth a Minister to Danger for being Conscientious; Answer'd, p. 95.

These eight Particulars contain his now Objections against our Defence; which we have answer'd, and, we hope, shew'd the Reader into how narrow a compass the Debate is brought.

VI. Such things as relate to Mr. Collyer's Defence of himself, his own Subscriptions and Practice.

1. He saith, that in his submitting to Impositions, he doth not own the Power of the Imposers; Answer'd, p. 20.

2. That

2. That there are no Abuses amongst Dissenters, by wicked Parents being unnatural to their Children, mentioned, p. 53.
3. That when exclusive Terms of Communion are used in his, and other dissenting Congregations, the People that scruple them have liberty to remove their Habitations; Answer'd, p. 54.
4. That he Subscribes only to a private Reading of Apocryphal Lessons, and not to the reading them in the Assemblies; Answer'd, p. 69. with 2d Def. p. 226.
5. That if the Justices allow of his Sense, before whom he Subscribes, he is safe; Reflect'd on, p. 72.
6. That he is not to regard the Sense and Intention of the Church, in subscribing the Articles; He being required to do it by the State; Answer'd, p. 75.
7. That by his Oath of Allegiance he is only bound to defend and support the Queen's Person, Crown, and Dignity, according to the Direction of the Laws; Argued on, p. 91. with 2d Def. p. 269, &c.

These seven Things contain the Heads of his Defence of himself, which we have modestly Reflect'd on.

5 JY 61

F I N I S H